

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

As this number is not only the first of a new volume, but also marks the beginning of the forty-first year of the Magazine, a short Foreword may be permitted. There have been letters of congratulation, very encouraging to receive, from all parts of the globe, and some of them from men who had subscribed from the very first number. Of Dr. Hastings' first number a contemporary wrote that he saw in it at once 'the promise and the potency and the certainty of life.' He was right in his forecast, for the circulation not only holds its own but increases steadily year by year. Nor does the standpoint change. Dr. Moffatt once described it as 'a steady adherence to the beliefs of Christianity, interpreted by the fresh results of criticism. Men came to see,' Dr. Moffatt continued, 'that Dr. Hastings knew how these could be held without evasion, and that he was ready to put the best available information at the disposal of not only scholars but his fellow Ministers.'

All the old features will be found in the new volume. The surveys of 'Recent Foreign Theology,' which keep readers in touch with everything of importance in theological thought abroad, will, as formerly, be in the capable hands of Professors J. E. McFadyen, Moffatt, H. R. Mackintosh, Tasker, and Principal A. E. Garvie.

The sermons given 'In the Study' will again follow The Christian Year. Readers might note that MSS. of children's sermons for special occasions should reach us two months before the date for which they are intended.

'Entre Nous,' besides its usual items, will contain from time to time studies of the religious motif in some of the best contemporary fiction.

In 1929 to 1930 there will be three new series of

articles. One will survey the contribution of Britain, America, France, and Germany respectively to Old Testament science, New Testament science, Systematic Theology, and Church History. The Old Testament articles will be done by Professor J. M. Powis Smith, Chicago (America); Professor A. R. Gordon, Montreal (Germany); and Dr. Arthur R. Siebens, Chicago (France). Germany's contribution in the other fields will be surveyed by Professor Völlrath, Erlangen (Systematic Theology); Professor James Mackinnon, Edinburgh (Church History); and Professor Dr. Martin Dibelius, Heidelberg (N.T.). Fuller particulars will appear later.

'The Cries from the Cross' will be the subject of the expository series of studies.

Under the general title 'The Mind of Christ on Moral Problems of To-day,' pressing ethical questions will be discussed, such as marriage, wealth, war, self-expression, commercial morality, education, and women and the ministry. Canon Charles E. Raven will write on the last named, and Professor John M'Murray on self-expression. Contributors whose articles will appear shortly will include The Bishop of Winchester; Dean Inge; Dean Simpson; Professor B. W. Bacon, 'The Blessing of the Peacemakers'; Rev. F. J. Rae, 'Education and Religion'; Dr. Rendel Harris, 'A Western Gloss in John 2nd'; Professor A. J. Gossip; Professor Fulton; Principal W. M. M'Gregor; Professor J. A. Robertson; Professor W. A. Curtis, 'A Study of our Lord's Temptation'; Rev. J. A. Morrison, 'Miracle and Natural Law'; and Mrs. J. A. Robertson, 'Religion and the Drama.' It is hoped also to survey soon the present position of Archaeological Study.

The Fourth Gospel seems to be coming back to its own among scholars, and if so, this will be a great boon not only to Christian thought, but to the ordinary Bible reader. For a considerable time we have been accustomed to see this Gospel and its witness put aside because of the uncertainty of date and authorship. The Synoptists have alone been treated as an authority on the ministry of Christ. The result of all this has been a neglect of St. John which has seriously impoverished Christian faith. The trend back to a more positive and confident position has been definite and reassuring.

Canon Scott Holland did excellent service some years ago by his little book in which he pointed out that a ministry of Jesus in Jerusalem was so likely that for Jesus to neglect the centre of His people's faith and life was unthinkable. Lord Charnwood as a layman also made a helpful contribution. But it is Dr. BERNARD'S great work on the Gospel that has, as it were, concentrated the trend towards a new confidence in it. Two of the reviews have long and elaborate articles on Dr. BERNARD'S commentary—the *Church Quarterly*, and the *London Quarterly*. It may be useful to summarize briefly the points to which the two writers draw attention.

First about the authorship, and along with that naturally the historical trustworthiness. It is generally agreed to-day that the author knew Mark and Luke, and freely corrected them. Further, it is agreed that the book is the work of an Aramaic, not a Greek, mind. Also, that, when the chronology of the Fourth Gospel conflicts with that of the Synoptists, the former is to be preferred. There is general agreement that the Gospel was written between 90 and 98. And there is a general agreement to attribute it, if not to an eye-witness, at least to an intimate acquaintance of an eye-witness.

Dr. BERNARD believes that the Gospel was written by 'John the Presbyter.' But the 'ultimate author' was the Apostle John. He was the 'witness' to whom the writer refers. And therefore it is his evidence the Gospel contains for the words

and deeds of Jesus. Just as Mark has the authority of Peter behind it, though *written* by Mark, so the Fourth Gospel, though *written* by the Presbyter, has the authority of John the Apostle behind it. This is an attractive theory, because it explains how the words of Jesus have filtered through another mind and been modified in the process. It explains the difference in form of the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptists and in St. John.

But the writer of the *Church Quarterly* article refuses to follow Dr. BERNARD in this matter. And he has a good deal to say for himself. His main point about 'John the Presbyter' is that there was no such person. The authority for his existence is a famous passage in Papias who refers to 'the Presbyter John.' The *Church Quarterly* writer, Mr. Fremenheere, contends that this was the Apostle. The Apostles were referred to as elders. Peter calls himself an elder (1 P 5¹). In short, there was only one John. Further, to clinch the matter, it is pointed out that the Gospel actually identifies the *writer* of the Gospel and the *witness* to its facts: 'the disciple who is witnessing concerning these things and wrote these things' (Jn 21²⁴). If 'John the Presbyter' is disposed of, then there remains only the Apostle as the sole author.

Another point of great importance is the relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptists. This is generally represented as one of contrast, greatly to the prejudice of the Fourth Gospel. The Synoptists are historical, the Fourth Gospel is unhistorical. An effort has even been made, as in the able book of Dr. L. A. Muirhead, to show that the incidents in John are allegories, not facts. This contrast is, however, fast disappearing under the hands of scholars. The tradition in John is in some respects proved to be more primitive than that in the Synoptists. Dr. BERNARD contends that the Fourth Gospel represents faithfully John's picture of Jesus Christ. Matthew Arnold's opinion is quoted that 'the fundamental themes of Jesus [in John] we maintain to be no "arid mysteries" at all, but to be in profound unison with "the sublime and pregnant discourses of the Sea of Galilee";

and we do not see who was capable of uttering them but Jesus.'

The special point of contrast which used to be maintained was the Christology of John. It was regarded as very different from that of the Synoptists. But closer study has dissipated this impression. The claims made for Jesus in Mark are as high as any that could be made. Further, there is nothing in John which is not implicit in Paul's Epistles, and these were written and published before the Gospels. In short, the contrast between the Synoptists and John, which was one of the strongest influences weakening the hold of the Fourth Gospel on Christian minds, does not exist. It is one of the great merits of Dr. BERNARD's great work that he has made this clear in detail.

In many quarters we hear of the necessity of a restatement of Christian dogma in view of modern thought, and naturally we turn with interest to what is probably the most recent discussion of this subject. It is contained in the composite volume, *Dogma* (reviewed in another column), and comes from the pen of Professor H. Maurice RELTON of King's College, London, with whose essay of forty-six pages on 'The Reconstruction of Dogma' the volume concludes.

The essay begins with an attempt to define Christianity. This is natural enough, as it is the dogmatic effort of Christianity that is *sub judice*. But the author might well have compressed this discussion and left more space for the development of his views on the nature of the reconstructed dogma. While we say this, we appreciate the point that a discussion of the question whether the original Christianity is truly represented by the phrase 'Jesus the worshipper' in contradistinction to the phrase 'Jesus worshipped' is a necessary preliminary to the question of the need of the reconstruction of historical Christianity in the light of modern thought.

For answer to the question, What was Christianity? Dr. RELTON maintains that the life of

Jesus of Nazareth cannot be divorced from the Life of the Christ of the Creeds, as this is witnessed to by Christian experience. Accordingly he finds at the heart of the Christian religion nothing less than the Dogma of the God-Man. Christianity must stand or fall ultimately, he says, by its adherence to or rejection of this concept of the Incarnation.

It follows that, if this be true, the Christian philosopher is committed to some form of Dualism. He is not free to accept either an absolute Monism or a thoroughgoing Pluralism as the solution of the Cosmic problem. But neither absolute Monism nor thoroughgoing Pluralism, nor indeed any other system of philosophy, is within measurable distance of being *the* philosophy of the twentieth century, and therefore *the* philosophy in terms of which we must present our faith for acceptance to-day. Thus we need not be afraid of being philosophically out of court if we seek to ally ourselves with a Dualistic type of philosophy.

On the other hand, restatement in terms of modern thought to-day is hindered by the fact that philosophical opinion is in a chaos. It is also hindered by the fact that the results of historical and Biblical study are as yet insufficiently determinate for the purposes of a restatement comparable in scope to that of the ancient formulae. Indeed Dr. RELTON is so impressed by the magnitude of these hindrances that the time does not appear to him to be ripe for a re-formulation of the Christian Faith.

But there is one modern philosophy, he avers, in which the doctrine of the Incarnation as the Church conceives it can find no adequate place. It is the modern philosophy of change, by which he means the philosophy which, abandoning the concept of Transcendence with the associated ideas of creation and a twofold order—heavenly and earthly—of reality, reads reality not as Being but as Becoming, not as a static changelessness but as a dynamic change. Such a philosophy appears to leave no room for that conception of God in relation to the world and human life which is indissolubly bound up with the Dogma of the God-Man. If the modern philosophy of change cannot entertain

the concept of Transcendence, Christian theology can have no part with it.

What kind of synthesis, then, between the concepts of Immanence and Transcendence is needed if we are to build up a distinctive Christian philosophy in which the full content of our Christian Faith shall find adequate intellectual formulation? It is the synthesis for which Christian Theism stands. Christian Theism lifts the whole problem of the One and the Many, of Monism and Pluralism, of Transcendence and Immanence, into the realm of ethical and spiritual, as distinguished from ontological, relationships. It deals in terms of personality. It is committed to the concept of finite created personality in relation to the Absolute Personality of God. In this concept alone is contained the view of the relation of God to the world which is most consistent with the whole content of experience, including, as this must, religious experience, or the experience of the soul in communion with God.

Dr. RELTON concludes by describing the kind of basis upon which he would reconstruct dogma in terms of modern thought. It would be upon the threefold foundation of Tradition, Reason, and Experience. A theology thus constructed would be saved at once from traditionalism, intellectualism, and emotionalism.

It would seek to do justice to historical Christianity as this presents itself in the form of the Catholic Faith supernaturally originated and historically mediated. It would submit the Catholic Faith to the considered judgment of the human reason. It would also submit the Catholic Faith as thus tested and judged to the verdict of disciplined experience. If such a presentation of historical Christianity critically sifted were found to answer to the needs of human life, we should be justified in regarding it as an adequate and satisfying reconstruction of dogma.

Who was the Rich Young Ruler who came to Jesus and asked about eternal life? The Rev.

T. A. MOXON believes firmly that it was St. Paul, and he gives his reasons in a rather fascinating article in the current *Church Quarterly Review* with the title 'Did St. Paul see Jesus Christ in the Flesh?' The writer begins by insisting that the invitation Jesus extended to the young man was one to apostleship. It was couched in exactly the same terms as Jesus used when He called Peter and Andrew and Matthew: 'Leave all and follow me.' If the young man was St. Paul, then this was his call to apostleship and his title to be regarded as one of the band.

The proof of the identification proceeds on two lines. The first claim is that the description given of the Young Ruler is in complete harmony with all we know of Paul's early life. St. Luke tells us that he was a 'ruler,' which means a prominent young member of the sect of the Pharisees. But we know of St. Paul that he was just that. He was educated in Jerusalem as a Pharisee under Gamaliel, and he was evidently destined for a high place in the official body. Again, when we remember Paul's deep dissatisfaction with the Law, and his autobiographical statement of this in Ro 7, is not this an echo of the young ruler's 'all these have I kept, but there is a lack yet'?

Again, the young man had 'great possessions.' Now Paul was obviously poor. But he cannot have been of a poor family. He had an expensive education. And, as Ramsay pointed out in 'St. Paul the Traveller,' his long stay at Cæsarea in 'free custody' was only possible to a man of means. Besides, Felix evidently expected a large bribe from him. And finally, the appeal to Cæsar was a very costly business. Ramsay suggests that Paul had inherited the family fortune at this time. In any case he had been a 'rich young ruler.' Is it not more than possible that, when he became a Christian, he obeyed the demand of Jesus to give up his wealth and position?

Further, it is often assumed that Paul was absent from Jerusalem when Jesus was there. But what ground is there for this assumption? He was

brought up in Jerusalem ; he had family links with the city ; he had a nephew there ; he was residing there shortly after the birth of the Church. The incident of the Young Ruler occurred shortly before the Crucifixion, and Paul's presence at the same time may be regarded as probable.

Finally, there are two statements of Paul's which appear to be conclusive in support of the belief that he had personal dealings with our Lord, and any attempt to explain them away seems to be an abuse of the plain meaning of words. The first is in 2 Co 5¹⁸, 'Yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more.' The second is 1 Co 9¹, 'Am I not an apostle? . . . Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?' Most commentators refer these words to the vision on the Damascus road. But, as a matter of fact, Paul is maintaining, in answer to his critics, that he has had personal knowledge of Jesus Christ, and

claims the title of apostle on that ground. If his only claim was the vision on the road to Damascus, the claim is pretty thin. But if Paul had seen Jesus and received the call 'follow me,' then his claim was unanswerable.

The second ground on which Mr. MOXON identifies Paul and the Young Ruler is that, if it is valid, certain incidents in Paul's life are explained that would otherwise be inexplicable. This part of the article is not so persuasive as the first part. But the trend of it is very much as follows. The 'goads' against which Paul had evidently been kicking were the thoughts and feelings aroused in him by the words of Jesus when He demanded a full surrender. They had been rankling in his mind, and he had tried to still them by his fierce opposition to the infant Church. The incident of the Gospels explains the whole of Paul's inner life before his conversion.

A. S. Peake.

BY PRINCIPAL W. B. SELBIE, D.D., MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

I FIRST came to know Peake when he was an undergraduate of St. John's College, Oxford, and we were both studying theology. We used to meet at Dr. Fairbairn's house, at various lectures, and at debating societies, and soon struck up a firm friendship. He was a quiet, gentle, unassuming little man, delicate even then, with no capacity for games, and taking little or no interest in ordinary undergraduate pursuits. By the student he was set down as a smug, but to those who really knew him he soon stood out as a man of mark. His conversational powers were extraordinary. We often spent the afternoon in a dinghy on the upper river—I sculling, while he steered a most erratic course, talking all the time. His subject was theology in some shape or form. We were both attending the lectures of Driver, Cheyne, and Sanday, and making acquaintance for the first time with the higher criticism of the Bible, then a new, and to most people rather terrible, thing. Peake reacted to it very characteristically. He had been brought up in the old orthodoxy, but

with a minute knowledge of, and intense affection for, the Bible. But he was very conscious of the difficulties which the old position raised, and he welcomed Pentateuch criticism in particular as an obvious way out. He set himself to master it, and was never weary of discussing the problem how to make criticism positive and constructive, an aid to faith rather than a hindrance. His whole bent of mind in these early and formative years but anticipated what was afterwards to become his life's work. He won the Denyer and Johnson Theological Scholarship, and took a first-class in the school, and immediately on taking his degree was appointed tutor in Hebrew and Old Testament in Mansfield College. No sooner had he begun work there than he was elected to a Theological Fellowship at Merton. At the time this was a remarkable appointment, seeing that he was a layman and a Nonconformist, and could only have been possible in the case of a very exceptional man. Peake continued to teach at Merton and Mansfield together, but only for a short time. His heart

was with his own people, and when he was called to teach theology in the Primitive Methodist College at Manchester, he felt that there was his life's work. So indeed it proved. At the Hartley College, the Lancashire Independent College, and in the then newly formed theological faculty of Manchester University he found a unique opportunity, and used it to the full. Many generations of theological students passed through his hands, and on all of them he left his mark. In his own denomination, Peake's men stand out for their scholarly equipment combined with evangelical power and zeal.

It should always be remembered that Peake was a convinced and loyal Primitive Methodist. His father was one of their ministers, and his own deep religious experience owed much to the warm evangelical atmosphere of his Mother Church. He never forgot this debt, for it meant more than a mere denominational attachment. He had passed through a religious crisis in his youth that determined his theological outlook. His interest in Paulinism, for example, and his deep understanding of it, are not to be explained by any merely academic reasons. They were the outcome of a sympathy born of a kindred experience. In many respects Peake was the most competent modern exponent of the mind of St. Paul, and to those who knew him the reason was not far to seek. To him, as to the Apostle, sin, redemption, and the grace of God in Jesus Christ were among the supreme experiences of life, and he brought to the interpretation of the Apostle's expression of his experience a knowledge born of sympathy. In writing and lecturing on St. Paul he always made it clear that he was dealing with the really fundamental things of the Christian life and faith. So far from finding in Paulinism an excrescence on the original Christian stock, as men not infrequently do, he came to regard it, and indeed to preach it, as the best key to the secret of Christianity. He always contended that St. Paul must be studied with the heart as much as with the head, and he was really speaking of himself when he said, 'The secret of the spell which the theology of Paul has cast on such multitudes is to be found in the illumination which it has brought to their own spiritual history.'

Looking back on Peake's work as a whole, it becomes quite clear that the most important feature of it was his power of mediating to ordinary people the results of Biblical criticism, and of modern theological study generally. He owed this partly to his training, and partly to his strategic

denominational position, but mainly to his own genius for combining spiritual fervour and devotion with ripe scholarship and intellectual honesty. While at Oxford he had been greatly influenced by Fairbairn, particularly in regard to the apologetic presentation of historical Christianity in relation to the great religions of the world. Fairbairn's pioneer work in this direction has perhaps never been appreciated at its true value. Peake realized to the full its timeliness, and carried the work forward in his own way. There were certain limitations in Fairbairn's outlook on modern theology which Peake was able to transcend, and, though he went much further than Fairbairn, he never failed to reckon himself as his disciple. His patient and exact scholarship gave him here a great advantage. More than any man of his time, he could, and did, write with authority both on the Old and the New Testaments. His work on the Epistle to the Hebrews and on Paulinism, on Isaiah, and on the problem of suffering in the Old Testament reveals him as an expert in a very wide field, and it may truly be said of him that in the realm of Biblical study he touched nothing that he did not adorn. And it was all done so simply and unostentatiously, without any parade of learning, and in language that any one could understand. Peake had an astonishing facility for dealing with great problems in a short compass, and yet clearly and effectively.

Such a book, to take only one example, as *Christianity, its Nature and Truth*, a collection of papers originally contributed to a popular magazine, contains at once an apologetic and a dogmatic—a restatement of the Christian faith in terms of the new knowledge. It is critical and yet thoroughly constructive, and that in a large free way that takes it well out of the category of an *ad hoc* apology. It is written, too, with such clarity and simplicity as to bring it within the reach of quite un instructed readers. The same, too, may be said of his really great book on the Bible, with its characteristic sub-title, 'Its Origin, Significance, and Abiding Worth.' Though it appeared some years ago, it has never been superseded, and is still the best book available for the serious student who wishes to obtain a complete survey of the whole field of Biblical criticism within a conveniently short compass. The writer of such a book has necessarily to commit himself to expressing his judgment on many disputed points. Here Peake excels and shows himself to be a really competent guide. He never sits on the fence, and never yields to extravagance. Where he thinks it well to

suspend judgment he says so, and gives his reasons, and his definite decisions are generally so well backed up that it is very difficult to quarrel with them. And he never suffers his reader to forget that to him the Bible is the Word of God and a very sacred thing. He never loses the saint in the scholar.

Peake's Biblical work culminated in his now famous one volume Commentary on the Bible, in which he secured the co-operation of many eminent scholars. Much of it he wrote himself, and he took his duties as Editor very seriously, supervising the whole, and leaving his mark upon it. It had an astonishing success, and it is quite legitimate that it should be known everywhere as 'Peake's' Commentary. It was written, of course, throughout from a soberly critical point of view. In spite of its moderation, however, it proved too much for those in all the Churches who are known as fundamentalists. Peake was astonished and a little distressed at the amount of vituperative and even threatening correspondence he received. He used to confess rather ruefully that if he required any proof of the need for such a work he had received it in abundance. But the work remains: an abiding monument of its editor's insight and skill.

It must not be supposed, however, that Peake was a scholar and nothing more. He was a great teacher, administrator, and preacher, and he brought to all his practical work the same shrewd common sense and deeply religious spirit that he showed in his studies. To his students he was a hero as well as a master. They learned from him the joy of intellectual achievement, for he taught them to think for themselves, and not remain mere echoes. As Dean of the Theological Faculty, Vice-Chancellor of the University, President of the Free Church Council, Editor of the *Holborn Review*, and a member of endless committees and conferences he showed a quiet sagacity that made his counsel always welcome, and gave him an ever-increasing influence. Though he preferred to remain a layman, he took an active part in Church work, and very frequently preached. He excelled in extempore speech, was clear, direct, incisive, and appealing. He would give an hour's address or lecture without a single note, and with

no loss of coherence. His voice was weak but penetrating, and his simple earnestness drove his message home. If preaching is the impartation of truth through personality, Peake had the gift to a remarkable degree. The man behind the sermon made the sermon count.

And all this was done by a man with a frail physique never far removed from invalidism. At one time he had to spend long periods lying on his back, but the work went on all the same. He used gleefully to admit that one reason why he was able to get through so much was that he gave to work the hours that most men spent in exercise. Yet he was no recluse. He loved intercourse with his fellows, shone in conversation, and had a great fund of good stories. He was keenly interested in every phase of life, and on social and political questions wielded an undoubted influence, especially among his own people. He did not shrink from controversy, as when the Education struggle was in its acute stages, but his spirit was eirenic, and he had no love for strife. He took an eager part in various conferences on Church reunion, and rejoiced in the accomplishment of Methodist union as at least a step in the right direction. But he had no illusions as to the difficulties in the way of union between the Free Churches and the Anglican. He felt that the time for it was not yet, that much spade-work had yet to be done on both sides, and a better mutual understanding to be secured. Probably no Free Church leader was ever more respected, trusted, and even loved by those who differed from him most widely. When Oxford opened her divinity degrees to others than Anglicans, he was chosen to be one of the first three to receive the honorary D.D. from his old University. I think he felt it to be the crowning honour of his career. He leaves behind him a stainless name and a memory of quiet but immensely effective service of God and man. Himself *anima naturaliter Christiana*, he made Christianity a more real and living thing to his generation. All the Churches are in his debt, but none so deeply as those 'Primitives' whom he loved and so loyally served. That they bring with them so fine a contribution to United Methodism is due to this one man, Arthur Samuel Peake.

Literature.

DOGMA.

THE substance of a recently published composite volume, *Dogma* (Nisbet ; 8s. 6d. net), was given as a course of public lectures at King's College, London, during the Michaelmas Term, 1928. The contributors, says Dean W. R. Matthews, who edits the volume, are all convinced that 'the Christian faith must be set in relation with the thought and science of the modern world,' and that it 'has the inherent power of truth to adapt itself to the intellectual conditions of every age.' Their contributions, which are studies of dogma in history and thought, are unequal in scope and style, nor are they consistent with each other in their respective attitudes towards the dogmatic effort of the past. Thus Mr. Hanson, whose subject is 'Dogma in Mediæval Scholasticism,' concentrates upon the dualistic aspect of mediæval theology, offers the best-written study, and shows himself the most intransigent, or—shall we rather say?—the least sympathetic with post-Kantian thought of all the seven contributors.

The editor discusses 'The Nature and Basis of Dogma,' emphasizing the symbolical character of religious knowledge and the aspect of tradition as a growing experience. Dr. Bicknell's subject is 'Dogma in the New Testament'; he also emphasizes the pictorial and symbolical ('mythological') character of doctrine, and holds that the dogmatic statements of the New Testament are able to convey truth in a form still adequate for life and worship. Dr. Gore, dealing with 'Dogma in the Early Church,' gives an historical statement of the patristic idea of 'the tradition,' and seeks to vindicate the Anglican rule of faith, with its particular appeal to the Bible, and especially to the New Testament. 'Dogma in Protestant Scholasticism' is the subject of a very useful and informative survey by Principal Franks. Dr. Jenkins writes with intimate learning on 'The Decline of Dogma and the Anti-dogmatic Movement,' but his contribution lacks definiteness and point. 'The Reconstruction of Dogma' is the important subject assigned to Dr. Relton. He comes really to grips with his subject when half-way through his essay, and the only points he has time to make are that the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation, which is for him the essence of dogma, can find no adequate place for itself in an immanentist philosophy, and that the reconstructed

dogma should be on the threefold basis of Tradition, Reason, and Experience. In this final contribution there is no traffic with modernist theology, and it may serve to illustrate once more what we have said as to the varying intellectual attitudes of the contributors : Dr. Relton appears to mediate between the editor and Mr. Hanson.

PERSONALITY.

Ourselves and Reality, by Mr. Ernest G. Braham, M.A. (Epworth Press ; 10s. 6d. net), is an extremely able discussion of personality in the light of the best modern philosophic and scientific thought. The treatise is in three parts. The first contains critical studies of British and American idealism represented by T. H. Green, Bradley, Bosanquet, Royce, and MacTaggart. The second treats of the reaction from idealism in Lotze, Martineau, William James, James Ward, and A. N. Whitehead. The third offers 'a constructive theory of personalism.' The reader is made to feel throughout that he is in the hands of a competent guide. The exposition is clear and masterly, the criticisms acute and the judgments balanced and weighty. One or two minor points may be noted. It is hardly a fair statement to say that Calvin regarded free will as 'incompatible with the divine decrees.' Professor J. S. Haldane (referred to as J. B. S. Haldane) is credited in the index with the authorship of 'The Reign of Relativity.' If Mr. Braham had had the opportunity of reading Professor Haldane's recently published Gifford Lectures on 'The Sciences and Philosophy' his reference on page 260 to Professor Haldane's position would have been fuller, and probably his whole treatment of the relation of body and mind would have been modified. Considerable attention is devoted to the philosophy of Whitehead, and the interesting suggestion is made that his 'position is basically similar to that of St. Thomas Aquinas.' 'When Whitehead has made a further elucidation of his theistic position, based upon his metaphysic of Nature, it may be that it will not be an approximation to that of St. Thomas Aquinas, but identical, and that we shall have the unexpected phenomenon of the new philosophy of Nature confirming orthodox Christian Theism.' In formulating his constructive theory of personalism Mr. Braham lays stress on the uniqueness of individuality as being 'the veritable core of personality,' he argues ably for the inter-

action theory of the relation of body and mind, and he pleads for a more consistent Theism, which says that God is not only possible but *real*, not "*coming into existence, but actually existent; not only in the process, but dominating it.*" Dealing with the question of personal immortality he reviews the various evidences—empirical, metaphysical, ethical, and religious, and finds his surest ground in the last. 'Belief in God is not only an ethical demand, but belief based upon the nature of God . . . the whole doctrine hangs upon the great reality of a God who is love.' An able and reassuring book, worthy in an eminent degree of its high theme.

JESUS-JESHUA.

If any one has earned the right to discuss the language and the *milieu* of Jesus it is Gustaf Dalman. This he has done with his customary fulness and exactness of knowledge in a book with the curious title *Jesus-Jeshua* (S.P.C.K.; 15s. net), a title which suggests two of the languages, Greek and Hebrew, which, Dalman argues, Jesus must have known, the other being Aramaic. Jesus could not have lived in isolation from the influence of Greek. Two of His disciples (Andrew and Philip), with their Greek names, were apparently related to the Greek cultural circle; the Syro-Phoenician woman with whom Jesus conversed was in respect of language a Greek; and the Greek text of the Gospels may be regarded as a thoroughly 'sound bridge' over the gap between us and the original words of our Lord. At the same time Hebrew did not entirely drop out of the life of the Jewish people, and the parents of Jesus would see that He should be instructed in the Torah and therefore also in Hebrew.

At the same time there is no doubt that Aramaic was the mother-tongue of Jesus, a few specimens of which survive in our Greek Gospels. Aramaic prayers must have been used in the Synagogue worship, and the whole matter is thus summed up by Dalman: 'To the two languages which our Lord knew (Aramaic, His mother-tongue, and Greek, the language of the government and of the foreign inhabitants of the land) must also be added as a third—Hebrew, the language of His Bible.'

The bulk of the book, however, is taken up with discussions of the Synagogue Service, The Preacher on the Mount, The Passover Meal, and the Cross, with the words of Jesus spoken from it. The interest of these discussions is very much more than linguistic, no fewer than ninety-nine pages, for example, are devoted to the Passover Meal alone.

But no small part of the value of Dalman's book is that he perpetually keeps before us the Aramaic equivalents for the Greek phrases and sentences of our Gospels, and thus, by illustrations drawn from Rabbinic parallels, he carries us as near the actual words of Jesus as it is possible for us, through a study of language, to come. It will be news for many to learn that the 'But I say' of the Sermon on the Mount has Rabbinic analogies. 'The contrasting of one's own opinion with that of others is not rare in the legal discussions of the Rabbis.' One Rabbi asserted his opinion five times against the famous Akiba in the words, 'Behold, *he* says . . . but *I* say' (*wa-anî 'ōmēr*). An appendix deals with Jewish proverbs and maxims, some of which are paralleled in the Gospels, and there is a valuable list of important New Testament verses in Aramaic. The book has been well translated by the Rev. Paul P. Levertoff.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD.

All that comes from the pen of Professor H. R. Mackintosh bears the stamp of sound scholarship and of sane and consistent thinking. He never soars into the clouds of speculation, but he sees his subject steadily and from all sides, and he sees deep into the heart of it. These qualities are again manifest in *The Christian Apprehension of God* (S.C.M.; 6s. net), a course of lectures delivered at the Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia. There are eight lectures in all, the first three dealing with the nature of religion and the idea of revelation, the other five dealing with the Christian conception of God—His personality, holiness, love, and sovereign purpose. Professor Mackintosh finds religion rooted in a fundamental human need of God. 'Atheism is a relatively modern product, and the attempt to place it near the outset of the human development would not now be repeated by any serious scholar.' He regards as a 'calamitous delusion' the idea 'that the lowest and least developed Nature-religions now extant afford a fairly exact picture of religion in its earliest form, and that by inspection of these we can tell how religion as such originated.' His treatment of the idea of revelation is a fine piece of exposition, well fitted to clear away much haziness of thought. Coming to the Christian doctrine of God, he paints a convincing picture in which holiness and love are seen in beautiful harmony. The love of God to a world of sinners is not to be taken for granted as an easy and axiomatic thing; on the contrary, 'the paradoxical and astounding character of the Divine

love' is to be emphasized. The lectures conclude with a careful discussion of the sovereign purpose of God in which the essential truth of Calvinism is set forth as 'a profound religious idea from which serenity and courage arise.' Few writers have such a gift of clear thinking lit with the steady glow of spiritual fervour.

RELIGION AND ITS NEW TESTAMENT EXPRESSION.

Religion and its New Testament Expression, by the Rev. H. Bulcock, B.D. (Williams & Norgate ; 10s. 6d. net), is said to be 'chiefly intended for the general thoughtful reader,' but its discussions are somewhat too technical to be of interest to any but serious students of religious psychology and Biblical criticism. For them an ample feast is provided, though the various ingredients may not suit every palate. The Christianity here presented is practically independent of the historic Christ. 'His influence might in large measure have been felt by us, transmitted through a succession of Christian personalities, without the origin of their influence being actually known to us.' The title very aptly indicates the writer's method. The first part of his book is devoted to an elaborate study of the religious consciousness which by its intuitions gives us a knowledge of God and immortality. In part two the Christian Gospel is treated as little more than an illustration of these intuitions. 'It may indeed seem that our main thesis that the Love of God is sensed as a cosmic intuition renders superfluous any revelation of the Love of God through the historic life and work of Jesus ; on the other hand, the mystic intuitions belonging to the world of Being must have their parallel facts in the processes of that world of Becoming in which we normally think, feel, and act.' The criticism of the New Testament writings is radical. Miracles are summarily rejected. 'What have they to do with faith ? What credential do they give to Jesus ?' The story of the Resurrection, 'if denied, would by no means involve the collapse of vital faith.' The developments of Christian doctrine in the Epistles are traced to their sources in Hellenism and the Mysteries. With all this the writer expresses a deep and worshipful devotion to the personality and teaching of Jesus, and makes the claim that he has been enabled 'to separate the eternal truth from the temporary form, and to relieve those who seek the fellowship of faith from an alien burden of unscientific first-century thought and even elements of semi-paganism.' He is hopeful that all this

may be 'a factor of reconciliation between some of the sections of a divided Christendom.'

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE SCHOOL.

No education can be complete without religious instruction, and no religious instruction can be adequate which ignores the Bible. It is, perhaps, not unnatural that in Christian instruction the New Testament should hold a more secure place than the Old, nevertheless 'the literature of the Old Testament is far too precious to be neglected.' These words are taken from the Preface of *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, by Mr. F. Fairbrother, M.Sc., Headmaster of the Cedars School, Leighton Buzzard, and Professor D. Russell Scott, M.A., Ph.D., Late Pusey and Ellerton Scholar in the University of Oxford (James Clarke ; 5s. net), and the book is warmly commended in a Foreword by John Strong, C.B.E., M.A., LL.D., Professor of Education in the University of Leeds.

The book is designed to meet the needs especially of senior pupils in schools, and it meets them admirably, as one would expect, considering that, while one of the writers is a well-known Biblical scholar, the other is an experienced and successful teacher. The authors have resisted the temptation to overload their book with minutiae for which the average boy has neither time nor inclination. Every book of the Old Testament is dealt with, but with a brevity which obliges the authors to confine the discussion to things of vital importance. Throughout the volume the results of sober criticism are presupposed, and the teachers or pupils who use it may be assured that the presentation of the literature is thoroughly modern ; they will have nothing in later life to unlearn. The treatment is clear and frank ; the sources of the Pentateuch are briefly explained, the differences between the prose and the poetical versions of the story of Deborah in Jg 4 f. are carefully noted, the divergences in Samuel are candidly acknowledged, the three parts of Isaiah (1-39, 40-55, 56-66) appear at different parts of the volume, which is at pains to trace the development of prophecy by setting the prophetic books in their chronological order, and the little poem, Is 63¹⁻⁶, is described as 'reflecting Jewish nationalism at its worst,' and inspired by a narrow patriotism 'which has led to much strife among the nations.'

One notable feature of the volume is that it indicates and summarizes passages of special interest and importance—in Ezekiel, for example, not only the well-known Vision of the Valley of

Dry Bones (37), but the striking, though less well-known, Dirge over Tyre (27). And better still, many passages remarkable either for their spiritual teaching or their literary beauty are printed *in extenso*, for example, Hos 14, Mic 6⁸⁻⁹, Song of Songs 8^{6ff.}, and the four Songs of the Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. This very commendable feature, which brings the pupil face to face with the actual text, should be of peculiar value to a generation which is more inclined to read *about* the Bible than to read the Bible itself. The chapter on the Psalter offers a good list of representative psalms.

The writers describe the object of their book thus : 'to provide a readable introduction to the literature of the Old Testament, and it is hoped that readers will gain a clear insight into the development of Israel.' The description is just, and the hope is justified by the simple, lucid, and scientific treatment of the material. We would very especially commend the book to senior scholars of our day schools, to teachers, and to all who are interested in the religious education of the young.

A SOCIAL GOSPEL.

Are the teachings of Christ social as well as religious and moral ? If so, whence do they derive and whither do they lead ? These are questions which Professor C. C. McCown, D.D., has set out to answer in *The Genesis of the Social Gospel* (Williams & Norgate ; 12s. 6d. net). The book contains the results of a careful and learned inquiry into all the material and spiritual conditions that played a part in the making of the Jewish people of Christ's day—the physical features of Palestine, the history of Israel, the religion of the prophets, together with all the varied streams of influence which flowed in from Egypt, Babylonia, and Persia. Much less space is given to the exposition of Jesus' teaching on social questions. Here it would appear that the writer has hardly given due weight to the element of originality in the spirit and teaching of Jesus. The 'negative attitude' of Jesus to property 'is to be interpreted merely as a natural expression of the nomadic-agricultural ideal which belonged to the cultural tradition of his race.' 'A simple life rejoicing in the good things of the world and in happy companionship with one's fellows, without envy, enmity, greed, censoriousness, or struggle for precedence and power, such is Jesus' ideal of life as one discovers it in the Synoptic Gospels.' This seems strangely inadequate, even when allowance is made for the fact that the writer

is dealing solely with the social side of the gospel. There is very much, however, in the whole treatment which is both true and instructive, while in regard to the historical summary of antecedents which occupies the major part of the book it would not be easy to find elsewhere so comprehensive an account of the material environment and spiritual ancestry of the Jewish people.

HERBERT THORNDIKE.

In this day of ecclesiastical rapprochement in which we breathe the air of Lausanne and Lambeth and witness the moving spectacle of two great Presbyterian denominations merging into one, it is inevitable that the great controversies of the seventeenth century on ecclesiastical polity should come to mind. In that distracted age and in that long dispute a place of great interest was taken by the subject of the work before us—*Herbert Thorndike, 1598-1672*, by Canon T. A. Lacey, D.D. (S.P.C.K. ; 6s. net).

Not many know Thorndike even by name. Probably not many will read his works, which indeed are not easily accessible. He cannot be described as a clear writer, and for literary style he seems to have had something like contempt. He read voraciously, perhaps he had done better in writing had he read rather less. He sees little with sufficient clearness because he sees too many things at once. So he needs a wise and understanding interpreter, and he has found one in Canon Lacey.

Canon Lacey's book is delightful to read. He—perforce as he explains—took a long time to write it, and the time has not been wasted. The work is valuable in our opinion not chiefly for its exposition of Thorndike, but as one of the fairest, most helpful histories we have read of the Anglican Church in the days of Cromwell and the Restoration.

THE AIMS OF EDUCATION.

The theme of education is everywhere at present. Nearly all the magazines have an article on it ; and books pour from the press to establish one or other point of view. We hardly know where we are in this field, and in this bewilderment we are glad of any gleam of light that shows a path. *The Aims of Education and other Essays*, by A. N. Whitehead, LL.D., Sc.D., F.R.S., Professor of Philosophy in Harvard University, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge (Williams & Norgate ; 7s. 6d.), will do something to guide us in the maze,

if only to show us where not to go. The main object of these able essays is to warn us that mere knowledge is a barren thing—what the writer calls ‘dead knowledge.’ Why, for example, do you teach equations? or mathematics at all? Often it is simply a barren thing, in the air, ‘inert ideas.’ You must teach the subject in connexion with *things*, and show that it is actual. ‘The pupils have got to be made to feel that they are studying something, and are not merely executing intellectual minuets.’ The writer protests not only against dead knowledge, but against the idea that there is one course of study which gives general culture, and another which gives special knowledge. The two must always be joined, or there is no real education. ‘You may not divide the seamless coat of learning.’ And over and over the author impresses on us that the aim of education is not facts, but wisdom; not knowledge, but chiefly appreciation with knowledge inset. All this is expounded in a series of brilliant chapters, full of suggestion, humour, and conviction. The book has a lot of dynamite lying about in it, and if the writer succeeds in blowing sky-high what he regards as fatal obstacles to education he will be content.

A brief conspectus and criticism of Premillennialism is offered by Professor George Ricker Berry, Ph.D., D.D., in a small book published in America, by the University of Chicago Press, and in this country by the Cambridge University Press. The book is entitled *Premillennialism and Old Testament Prediction*, and much of it consists of quotations from the works of prominent representatives of the doctrine criticised. Professor Berry has no difficulty in showing how little such a doctrine can appeal to a mind trained in the modern view of prophecy. Its Judaistic, material, and often positively unchristian quality, with its deliberate appropriation of the imprecatory psalms and its occasional emphasis upon the restoration of the bloody sacrifices, rests upon the assumption that the whole Bible is infallible and that the chief element in prophecy is prediction. Some aspects of the doctrine repel us by their cruelty, as when we are told that ‘it is an absolute crime to go out and deceive people with the talk about peace, to tell them that nation will not war against nation’; others repel us by their grotesqueness, as when we are told that ‘during the millennium Jesus and the Church will be in heaven but they will also be

reigning over the earth’—that is, they will be in two places at the same time—and the difficulty is got over by the supposition that ‘Mount Zion will be so elevated that it will form a connection between earth and heaven’! It is distinctly worth while to have a doctrine, the literature of which can hardly be said to be familiar to the average religious person, presented and criticised by a scholar like Professor Berry; but it does seem a pity that a small book of thirty-seven pages, with less than two hundred and fifty words to the page, should cost 6s. 9d. net in this country. We are anxious to keep in touch with the theological discussions of our American friends, but such a price for so small a book goes a long way towards making the fulfilment of so laudable an ambition impossible.

A very refreshing book has been written by Dr. J. H. B. Masterman, the Bishop of Plymouth, on *The Christianity of To-morrow* (Cassell; 7s. 6d. net). It is a review of the present situation, religious, ecclesiastical, and theological. The writer has a broad mind, and is able to do what seems impossible for some people, to see the big things big and the little things little. He has also a facile pen and a pleasant style which make the book easy to read. The themes he deals with are the large religious realities, the Person of Christ, the Fatherhood of God, the Social Gospel (this is specially good), the Reunion of the Churches, and the Bible of To-morrow. The chapter on the Old Testament is one of the best statements on the value of the Old Testament in the light of criticism, that we have seen for long. Here and there we find assertions which are a little difficult to accept. ‘There is no justification for the claim that every Christian layman is a priest—there is no “priesthood of the laity” as such’ is one. ‘The statement in the preface of the Anglican Ordinal, that “from the Apostles’ time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ’s Church: Bishops, Priests and Deacons,” may be accepted as substantially true,’ is another. But such doubtful deliverances are rare, and one can say of the book as a whole that it is not only interesting and helpful, but an extremely valuable contribution to the reconciliation of the average man’s ‘modern mind’ with the religion of Jesus Christ.

The Christian World Pulpit for the half-year from January till the end of June contains abundant proof from cover to cover of the all-round excellence of preaching in all our Protestant religious denominations. ‘Ecce Homo! This is what the

Church keeps saying all the way around the world.' In the volume are addresses by archbishops, bishops, deans, canons of the Anglican Church, principals and professors of theological colleges, and leading ministers of all denominations. There is no phase of the religious thought and activity at the present time that is not frankly and faithfully dealt with in many of these addresses and sermons on special occasions (The Christian World Ltd. ; 7s. 6d. net). A sermon, in abridged form, will be found in 'The Christian Year.'

It is impossible to read the biographical study of *Eugene Stock* which Miss Georgina A. Gollock has written at the request of the Church Missionary Society (3s. 6d. net) without heartily endorsing the opinion of the Bishop of Bradford that here was 'a grand old man, a great Christian and a missionary statesman of very high order.' Born, reared, and educated in London, Mr. Eugene Stock as a layman became the Secretary of the Church Missionary Society in 1881, an office which he filled with the greatest zeal and distinction till 1906, when failing health compelled him to seek relief from the responsibilities and arduous labour of that position. He was to signalize the remaining years of a life prolonged to its ninety-second year by writing a marvellously comprehensive and interesting history of the first century of the Society's manifold labours throughout the world. He had the pen of a ready writer, and although not so gifted as a preacher or speaker, yet he was so thoroughly at home with his subject that he was everywhere welcomed in pulpit or platform or conference as one who spoke with special authority. We are told that Dr. Stock, as he became in his later years, would not have found the Church Missionary Society congenial if in it his wider fellowship had been curtailed. He gave his active adhesion to the rule of the Society that 'a friendly intercourse shall be maintained with other Protestant Societies engaged in the same benevolent design of propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ.' Despite the length of years on which he could look back he had always an open mind to such an organization as the Student Christian Movement, and could cherish the ardent hope that the best was yet to be.

A convincing defence of the Protestant standpoint was long overdue. The Roman Church has been engaging in a persistent propaganda for some years, and it is time, and more than time, for the other side to have an innings. This task has been undertaken, and brilliantly carried through, in

The Protestant Faith and Challenge, by the Rev. R. Pyke (Epworth Press ; 3s. 6d. net). The book came out of a series of week-night lectures which the writer gave on 'Protestantism.' He was surprised at the interest excited, and at the numbers who attended. We venture to predict a similar interest and reception for the lectures in their published form. The line of argument is a natural one. It begins with a study of the Church of the New Testament, and proceeds to trace the changes that took place in the course of years, the intrusion of the priest, the emergence of the Pope, and the hardening of the Church into an institution with vast power. Then comes a study of the Reformation, followed by a section on the great principles of the Protestant faith—justification by faith, the liberty of the soul, the priesthood of all believers. One thing must be said of all the writer's work. It is thoroughly candid. He never 'presses.' The Scripture passages are carefully and honestly expounded, and this may be said specially of the great passage about Peter and the rock. On the whole, this book may be commended as a fair, able, and persuasive statement of the Protestant faith, not as a sectional or negative thing, but as a reflection of New Testament Christianity.

If it be true, as the 'British Medical Journal' has asserted, that there is no tissue of the body wholly removed from the influence of spirit, then the healing art as commonly practised by the medical profession seems to stand in need of some revision. *Psychology in Service of the Soul*, by the Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead, M.A. (Epworth Press ; 3s. 6d. net), indicates lines along which certain cases may be treated with beneficent results. The writer, a trained psychologist, maintains that among cases of psychic disorder giving rise to physical symptoms there are many which are the result of spiritual disharmony, in plain words of sin. These may best be treated by the experienced pastor of souls rather than the medical practitioner, but the former ought to be more fully equipped than he usually is with a knowledge of the principles of psycho-therapy. Mr. Weatherhead's treatment of the subject is very sane and competent, but the judicious reader will not fail to reflect that psycho-analysis is a perilous path beset with pitfalls, and that its methods might have disastrous effects in the hands of an unskilled and tactless minister.

It is difficult to believe that the sermon with the title 'The Divine Pathfinder,' which is given

in 'The Christian Year' this month, was written by a man of eighty-seven. But it has been taken, though in considerably shortened form, from a collection of sermons by the late Dr. W. L. Watkinson which has just been published by the Epworth Press (3s. 6d. net). The title of the volume is *The Stability of the Spiritual*. It contains nine sermons, and all of these, full of thought and expressed in well-chosen language, were written in the last year of Dr. Watkinson's life. The sermons are prefaced by an appreciation by Mr. G. Beesley Austin. No suggestion is made that a longer biography is in preparation, and so it behoves all Dr. Watkinson's friends—and they were many—to get this volume. Dr. Watkinson's early circumstances made scholarship, in the strict sense of the word, impossible for him. But his natural gifts were of so high a quality that he overcame all early disadvantages and became a preacher of outstanding power and distinction. He entered the ministry in 1858, was elected to the Legal Hundred in 1883, became Fernley Lecturer in 1886. In 1893 he became Connexional Editor, a post which he held until 1904. When the Wesleyan Conference was held in Leeds in 1897 he was president. But Mr. Austin's short account of Dr. Watkinson does not do more than outline the events of his life. The space is used to the best advantage with an account of Dr. Watkinson's mental and spiritual development from the time when 'the homage of a lad's soul' went out 'to the fairest and the highest he had seen.' Four graces in especial he had—a rare simplicity, a gift of appreciation, and a gift of praise, and, in addition, Mr. Austin says, he was 'the humblest man I have ever met.'

Mr. H. W. B. Joseph, M.A., has published *A Comparison of Kant's Idealism with that of Berkeley* (Milford; 1s. 6d. net), being the Annual Philosophical Lecture under the Henriette Hertz Trust read before the British Academy on July 3, 1929. It seems to the author that there are some points of interest in the relation of Berkeley's thought to Kant's which he has not found worked out. With reference to the question of the existence of a world of bodies in space independent of mind, which both Berkeley and Kant deny, 'Kant, it may be said, asks of mind in us more than, on his theory, it could achieve; Berkeley, in a sense, asks too little.'

The Rev. F. H. Wales, B.D.(Oxon.), whose translation of the first Book of the Psalter we had

occasion to commend some time ago, has followed it up by a *Translation of the Psalms—Book II.* (Milford; 1s. net), which maintains the high standard of excellence set by the former translation. There is the same regard for the literary form of the Psalter, and the same intimate acquaintance with the criticism of the text. As an illustration of the latter take 49⁷, 'surely none can at all ransom himself' (not 'his brother'), while the former is illustrated by the careful attention paid to refrains, for example, in Pss 42 f., 46, 49, 56 f., 59, 62, 67. There is real scholarship in this little book, which quite unobtrusively keeps the lay reader abreast of modern criticism and leaves him with a translation more accurate and scarcely less appealing than those of the familiar English version.

The George Dana Boardman lectureship on Christian Ethics has produced a considerable number of volumes by writers distinguished and not so distinguished. James Moffatt, Francis G. Peabody, Charles Foster Kent, and Lyman Abbott have contributed. The last five lectures, by different hands, have all been printed together in one volume with the title *Christian Ethics* (published in this country by the Oxford University Press; 6s. 6d. net). The subjects are 'Christian Ethics in Everyday Life,' by Frederick R. Griffin; 'Ethics in Education,' by Edwin C. Broome; 'The Christian Home,' by W. P. McNally; 'The Originality of Christian Ethics,' by George C. Foley; and 'The Two Roads,' by Boyd Edwards. They are all good, solid, and satisfying discussions of familiar topics. There is no startling originality about any of them. But the ground is well covered, and the reader will find the treatment helpful and stimulating.

The Rev. Canon A. R. Whitham, M.A., Principal of Culham College, seeks to provide in *St. Paul* (Rivingtons; 12s. 6d. net) a connected view of the Apostle's life and letters, which may serve as a simple and popular introduction to a closer and deeper study of the Acts and the Epistles. He has been successful in his aim, and the usefulness of his book is enhanced by its clear and straightforward style. It will be found a particularly useful book by teachers of divinity in schools and training colleges. It should be observed that while Canon Whitham adopts a conservative standpoint on questions of authenticity and genuineness, he is familiar with other standpoints. The book contains four maps.

In that excellent series 'Translations of Christian Literature' there now appears *Saint Bernard: The Twelve Degrees of Humility and Pride*, by Mr. B. R. V. Mills, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). The

'Introduction' by Mr. Mills and his excursus on Cistercian monastic life are very illuminating; and St. Bernard's little work here adequately made available for the ordinary reader repays study.

The Great Church Union in Scotland.

BY PROFESSOR H. R. MACKINTOSH, D.PHIL., D.D., EDINBURGH.

ON the second day of October 1929 there will take place, *Deo volente*, what it is not unfitting to call the greatest event in the ecclesiastical history of Scotland since the Reformation. There will then be consummated an incorporating Union of the two Presbyterian Churches of national dimensions. They are the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland. Neither, in becoming one with the other, will part with its identity, and the designation of the reunited whole will be 'The Church of Scotland.'

For centuries, Scotland has been a land of Church divisions and reunions. The Secession Church and the Relief Church, both dating from the eighteenth century, came together in 1847, to form the United Presbyterian Church; in 1867 the Reformed Presbyterian Church merged in the Free Church of Scotland; in 1900 the United Presbyterian Church combined with the Free Church to form the United Free Church, one of the two Churches covering the whole country, which are now to become one. These are only the largest of the unions in the past. And it is to be noted that even when breaking off originally from the Establishment, for reasons of conscience, none of the separating Churches would for a moment have owned that it was forfeiting its share in 'The Church of Scotland.' A difference of conviction had emerged, only for a time, as was hoped, with regard to the right relations of Church and State; but there was no divergence of doctrine. The question how State and Church are to be adjusted to each other has been the one great controversy which led to Scottish ecclesiastical divisions, and it is because this question has for all immediate purposes been solved—so far as any vast human problem admits of solution—that the great Union of to-day is possible.

Union has always been the declared policy of both Churches. To the Church of Scotland, formerly, union was conceivable only on the basis

of Establishment, in the main as then existing; to a large majority of the United Free Church, as of the Churches from which it sprang, union appeared something that could be achieved solely by Disestablishment, such as had occurred in Ireland. But in the present century various motives began to alter the temper on both sides. The purely religious desire for Christian Unity awoke and spread widely. It was felt that the first step for Scottish Christians holding the Presbyterian order was to get *themselves* united. Keen observers of life called attention loudly to the fact that the distribution of religious forces no longer corresponded to the distribution of the people; new districts too often were nearly churchless; and something like a quarter of the whole population of the country was adrift from Christian fellowship. The sense of these evils was sharpened by a new feeling of shame over the Church's waste of its actual resources. Visitors to a country village could find, distressingly often, that three or even four different Presbyterian bodies faced each other across its streets or lanes, no one of them strong enough to provide an inspiring common life or to tackle urgent social tasks. The scandal of what seemed too like rivalry for rivalry's sake became intolerable. In addition to this, to some extent as its consequence, the Churches had to face a shortage of clergy. For some years it has been increasingly difficult for vacant congregations in the outlying parts of Scotland to secure ministers. 'In our combined Presbyteries, numbering twenty-seven charges,' said a representative of an island group the other day, 'thirteen charges are without a pastor.'

In spite of old divisions, it was less difficult than might have been supposed to kindle the beacon of Church Union and gather men around it in eager masses. Let it be remembered that in Scotland the contrast of Church and Dissent has counted for little. Those who loved to 'unchurch' their

neighbours, if only it could be done with a show of religious earnestness, were few. The members of different communions intermarried freely. Even those who lived outside it were aware that the Church of Scotland has often been violently opposed to Erastianism, and on occasion well knew how to keep the State in its proper place. And spectators of the United Free Church could see that it, not less than its neighbour, held the ideal of a Church which should bring the blessings of the Christian gospel to every door in the land. Thus, once the movement towards union had begun, the forces that must increase its speed and weight were powerful.

Nothing more can be attempted here than the briefest historical sketch of the negotiations which have led to the present position, with its incalculable potencies for good. In 1908, after pioneer work by Dr. Mair, and under the influence of Dr. Archibald Scott, of St. George's, Edinburgh, the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland proposed to the United Free Church that the two communions should join hands in religious co-operation throughout the country, and was answered that not co-operation but union was the best thing to consider. Thereupon the Church of Scotland, taking its courage in its hands, with a public spirit which cannot be overpraised, definitely accepted this proposal for 'unrestricted conference'—that is to say, such conference about the impediments to union as should not presuppose that the rights and wrongs of 'establishment' were a forbidden topic. This proposal was accepted, and in 1909 negotiations began. The 'will to unite' was at last present.

For some years progress was slow and doubtful. Both sides stood more or less on the defensive; each was anxious to state its own case, to expose weak points in the other's armour, to give nothing away. There was a good deal of able but rather barren dialectic, which perhaps did no great harm but led nowhere. Members of the 'Two Hundreds,' as the conferring committees were popularly styled, could tell of days when the utmost pessimism prevailed and men began to ask, half in despair, whether it was worth while to go on. As Dr. Alexander Whyte one morning set out for a critical meeting between the representatives of both Churches, he said to his companion sorrowfully: 'This is the end.' They seemed to be up against a blank wall, in which even the optimism of faith could perceive no door.

Then came an abrupt change. In 1912 appeared a Memorandum, the authorship of which has been

widely ascribed to Lord Sands,¹ now an eminent Judge of the Court of Session, and which the best minds at once felt must clear the air and open up new possibilities of action. It suggested a fresh method of approach. Hitherto the United Free Church had felt it to be a fatal difficulty that the constitution of the Church of Scotland was prescribed for and conferred upon it by the State; and with a Church so constituted, it declared, it could not unite. The Church of Scotland with perfect sincerity refused to acknowledge that its constitution could be thus described, holding that its relation to the civil power was of quite another kind. Now came the epoch-making Memorandum. There the proposal was made that instead of endlessly debating so controversial a point, on which agreement never could be reached, the Church of Scotland should adopt another course. Let it first of all set down the constitution which it believed itself to possess by inherent right, identifying itself as in creed a branch of the Holy Catholic Church, stating its adhesion to the fundamental principle of national religion and not less its full spiritual independence as a Church of Christ; and, with this self-expressed constitution in its hand, let it next approach the State through Parliament, and request that this constitution should be not conferred but acknowledged. What both sides held the State cannot give, since it has no authority in spiritual matters, the State none the less may recognize as existing. It may take cognizance of that which it cannot bestow.

It was resolved to pursue this path. The Church of Scotland was, of course, entirely willing that the State should admit publicly its possession of intrinsic powers it had been accustomed to claim for itself, and the United Free Church was quick to mark the difference between a State-imparted and a State-acknowledged constitution. Things do not change in character by their character being confessed; and if a Church is convinced of its own freedom, it is not the less free because the State admits the fact. Manifestly the new road was full of promise. Accordingly, with care and gravity, the Church of Scotland set itself to the task of thinking out afresh, and formulating in unambiguous terms, the constitution by which it meant to live. In the main the task was not difficult, but it demanded the utmost care, and it took time. The work had not proceeded far when in 1914 the tragedy of war overwhelmed the world.

¹ It certainly owes most to his courageous wisdom.

The influence of the Great War upon negotiation between the Churches was almost paradoxical in character. On the one hand, in the tumult and perplexity of the time, the business of Union had perforce to be almost completely suspended. More urgent affairs absorbed the mind. On the other hand, the anxieties and labours of war-time drew men and Churches more closely together than had been the case within human memory. Thus, while conference for the moment ceased, the ministers and members of the two communions entered into a more warm and intimate fellowship, sharing each other's sorrows, tasting of the same consolations, helping each other out in similar fields of duty. In scores of parishes, during the absence of one minister in France or Gallipoli, his colleague of the other Church took over the whole work, and the congregations worshipped together for months at a time. It was not merely that they prayed under the same roof; they came to know each other; and ignorance of what the other side is thinking and feeling has been one great reason why divisions in the Christian Church have persisted. We misinterpret what is seldom or never before our eyes.

At last the War ended, and in an atmosphere hallowed by the universal memory of sacrifice and valour the Union conferences were resumed. All along the Church of Scotland had been at work on the domestic task of framing its constitution, and in 1919 the final draft of the Articles¹ in which that constitution is set forth was made public. Nine in number, the Articles affirmed the essential adherence of the Church of Scotland to Trinitarian and Evangelical Protestantism, and in unequivocal words asserted its right to do such vital things as formulate its own subordinate standards of doctrine, constitute its own courts, and add to the Articles themselves. The document is an impressive one, and has frequently been described as affording a better statement of the spiritual principles for which the United Free Church stood than that Church itself had ever succeeded in giving.

Thus equipped, the Church of Scotland next addressed itself to Parliament. Suffice it to state that as a result there was passed in 1921 an Act the importance of which cannot possibly be rated too high. This measure did not *enact* the Articles —this was done in 1926 by the Church of Scotland—but it removed the legal obstacles to that Church adopting those Articles as its constitution. It did more. Not only was the constitution of the Church of Scotland thus made explicit, but there was on

the part of the State a new recognition of the Church's right to exercise powers which previously it could not have exercised without the consent of Parliament. The Act of 1921 was, indeed, a great event in the history of jurisprudence. For the first time the State now acknowledged the Church in its full and proper character as *a Church*, that is to say, as a spiritual reality possessed of inherent powers of self-government and self-development. Not the least satisfactory feature of the Act was its express declaration that nothing in its provisions was to prejudice the position of other Churches. It was a worthy issue of centuries of argument, sacrifice, and faith. Now, at last, was abolished what had been the chief source of all the cleavages in the ancient Church of Scotland—the unwarrantable interference of the State in the Church's spiritual affairs. It was now possible to see the Church in 'the right relations to the State'; in relations, to express it otherwise, of recognized freedom and autonomy which could also be entered into and enjoyed by other Churches at their will.

There still remained a second obstacle to union. The United Free Church had from the first explained that union was possible for it only on the condition that the one Church was in as full and untrammelled possession of its property as the other. This brought up the question of the *teinds* (roughly equivalent to the English *tithes*). For long a keen debate had been in progress on the question whether the teinds were public property or represented the gifts of pious donors long ago, so as to form in strictness 'the patrimony of the Church.' The debate had led to no clear result, and few sensible men believed it would ever lead to any. In that case, why should not the matter be laid before Parliament for a decision which should be final? The Church of Scotland resolved upon this step. Accordingly, at its instance a Parliamentary Committee was set up, presided over by Lord Haldane, and charged with the duty of reporting upon the civil endowments of the Church. The outcome was an Act, passed in 1925, which brought the present system to an end, and vested the Church of Scotland in these ancient endowments as its own legally unchallengeable property, to be used ever after for the religious good of Scotland. The endowments, unfortunately, were not converted into or commuted for a capital sum, as had been done more or less in Ireland and Wales, as Lord Haldane's Committee had recommended, and as the Church of Scotland itself had strongly desired. For financial reasons this was found to be imprac-

¹ The first draft appeared in 1914.

ticable. But the land-charge which still remains is wholly different from the teinds. It can be redeemed at any time ; it can be bought and sold like a feu-duty ; and, in addition and most important, it is subject to the central free control of the Church and only in part tied up with a particular parish, and even there not with any single congregation.¹

These Acts having been placed on the statute-book, thus removing the main causes which had kept the Churches apart, the two Churches were free to take up the task of negotiating the actual terms of union. This has occupied the last three or four years. The upshot of ceaseless discussion and statesman-like adjustment may be seen mainly in two documents of fundamental importance for the new united Church. These are the 'Basis of Union' and the 'Plan of Union.' Broadly, but not inaccurately, it may be said that the 'Basis' deals with matters of constitution, the 'Plan' with administration. As it lies before us, the 'Basis' contains the vital constitutional documents of both Churches, e.g. the Act of Union (sometimes called 'the Uniting Act'), the Articles of the Church of Scotland as described above, the United Free Church Act anent Spiritual Independence dating from 1906 (this was passed after the famous House of Lord's decision of 1904, and gave fresh and unambiguous expression to the Church's claim to autonomy as well as its right to develop its own constitution), the Declaratory Acts of 1879 and 1892 regarding the Westminster Confession of Faith, and the Questions and Formula to be used at the ordination of ministers in the united Church. Provision is also made in the 'Plan of Union' for the establishment of a central fund for the Maintenance of a Gospel Ministry from end to end of Scotland. As might be expected, the 'Basis' and 'Plan' are coloured throughout by the two profound spiritual principles for which the Churches have worked and suffered—the national recognition of religion, or the doctrine that nations as such, and not individuals only, owe obedience to Christ ; and the spiritual freedom of the Church, or the doctrine that the civil power has no jurisdiction in her spiritual affairs. In future years, it is certain, these two great convictions, in defence of which not much ink merely but blood has been spilt, will continue to inspire and guide the re-united Church of Scotland.

¹ Over this transaction the Church of Scotland lost about one-sixth of the whole annual revenue from teinds, but in return gained an unfettered control of her entire property.

One problem of no little significance which has had to be tackled within these last years, as a rider to the general settlement, is the relation of the Church's Theological Colleges to the national Universities. Hitherto the Church of Scotland, without setting up separate Divinity Colleges of her own, has utilized the Theological Chairs in the Universities for the training of her students. She did not appoint the professors, though they must be members of her communion, and her power to remove them, for any grave fault of life or doctrine, was questioned. In the United Free Church the professors of theology are appointed, controlled, and salaried by the Church itself. Two such systems, it is obvious, cannot simply be amalgamated, and a revision of methods is indispensable. But wisdom and goodwill have not been lacking, and three general principles which should govern any rearrangement have been agreed to. 'The first is that the existing University Theological Chairs, while they should be freed from the statutory (theological) tests now imposed upon the holders of such Chairs, should be continued in some form of which they would still be serviceable for the instruction of the students of the Church. The second is that the relations between the Theological Colleges and the Universities should be as close as possible. The third is that the Church must retain effective control over those to whom the doctrinal instruction of its Ministry is to be intrusted.' In harmony with these conditions, it is now proposed that future appointments to the existing University Theological Chairs (possibly with some modification in the subjects assigned them) should be made by an Electoral Board equally representative of the Church or Churches and the University. Further, the professors of the United Free Church Colleges holding office at the date of Union are to become professors in one of the University Faculties of Theology, the Church guaranteeing payment of their salaries ; and on the same terms their successors will be appointed by the Church. As teachers of the Church will thus acquire the status of University Professors, so students preparing for the ministry will be matriculated students of the University. This general scheme, though it has gained the substantial assent of Churches and Universities, cannot be put in force until there has been obtained the legislation necessary to abolish tests, the relinquishment by present patrons of their rights of patronage, and the approval by the Universities' Committee of the Privy Council of the conditions of tenure attached to the new Chairs. But the framework of the scheme is fixed. It is a vital element in its value

that it implies no monopoly for the Church of Scotland in the new Theological Faculties of the Universities. Powers, for example, are to be taken to admit of other Churches being represented on the Appointments Board.

As we look back and summarize our impressions of these great changes, we are entitled to say that the Christian communion about to be formed will rightly bear the name of 'the Church of Scotland'—national and free. It will be, in the language of the Articles, 'representative of the Christian Faith of the Scottish people.' With respect to her possession of the intrinsic freedom without which no Christian Church is equal to its idea, no doubt can exist in any unprejudiced mind. The language of the Articles is unambiguous. 'This Church,' we read in Article V., 'has the inherent right, free from interference by civil authority, but under the safeguards for deliberate action and legislation provided by the Church itself, to frame or adopt its subordinate standards, to declare the sense in which it understands its Confession of Faith, to modify the forms of expression therein, or to formulate other doctrinal statements, and to define the relation thereto of its office-bearers and members, but always in agreement with the Word of God and the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith contained in the said Confession, *of which agreement the Church shall be sole judge*,¹ and with due regard to liberty of opinion in points which do not enter into the substance of the Faith.' Could anything be more lucid, straightforward, or sufficient? The united Church will be free, as soon as it may judge it wise, to draw up a simpler statement of its Faith, and put it in place of the Westminster Confession. But the new doctrinal statement, as Article I. makes equally clear, must be Trinitarian, Evangelical, and Protestant in character. It must not be, for example, Unitarian or Romanist. And if it be replied that Article I. binds the Church to an outworn doctrine of the Trinity by its use of the term 'substance,' in the phrase concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost which runs, 'the same in substance, equal in power and glory,' the question may well be asked in rejoinder, why the term 'substance' should alone of all ancient theological words, be incapable of re-interpretation. If 'substance' at one time did imply what was less or lower than personal or

spiritual, it may now be read in a higher sense. It may be read in the light of the conviction, taught us by Christ Himself, that the 'essence' of Godhead is Holy Love.

The hope had been cherished that the United Free Church, like the Church of Scotland, might pass into the Union with unbroken ranks, leaving not a man behind. But this hope, apparently, is not to be fulfilled. As there have been conscientious objectors at other points of history, so now there remains a Minority, of uncertain and dwindling size, the members of which insist on the abandonment of all aid from funds derived 'from public sources,' as well as on freedom to alter Article I. in the Church of Scotland's new constitution. The first of these conditions offends against the sense of justice, for it has not been the habit of this country to deprive people thus peremptorily of property they have held for centuries, nor is it in harmony with the feeling, prevalent in the United Free Church from the outset, that the question of endowments was a domestic affair to be settled, as in fact it has been settled, between the Church of Scotland and Parliament. As regards freedom to change Article I., it has always proved impossible to discover in what sense the Minority desire to be free from the doctrinal particulars actually stated in the Article, interpreted by the free judgment of the Church, not to speak of the fact that the United Free Church is itself bound by precisely the same doctrine. It hardly appears as if the position of the Minority would enable them to address a call, vivid and compelling, to the best religious mind of Scotland.

The Union of the Churches will not of itself, it may be freely granted, bring in the Kingdom of God in Scotland. But the failure of this effort to bring Christians together would have struck a dire blow at the religious prospects of the country. It would have led many to turn from organized Christianity with a natural resentment. Union, we cannot too often remind ourselves, is an act of faith and duty. 'One step enough for me' is a motto which has served well in the past, and still serves. No Church can be free except as it dares to be free, and puts its freedom constantly in operation. At this hour prayer is going up from unnumbered devout hearts that the experience of Union may enkindle our love to Christ, inflame our zeal, and enable us so to discern the will of God, and so faithfully to perform it, that His name may be glorified, and His Church built up in faith and hope.

¹ Italics mine. The phrase recurs in the Preamble to the Questions for Ordination.

The Pastorals and a Second Trial of Paul.

BY THE REVEREND F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK, D.D., MALDON.

It was Paul's plan to visit Spain after Rome. Of his intention to visit Rome we hear frequently (Ro 1¹¹, 13 15²³, Ac 19²¹; cf. 2 Co 10¹⁶). But he did not intend to stay. He would not build upon another's foundation (Ro 15²⁰), a sentiment that would be appreciated by Romans whose Romulus legend was connected with another's *foundation*. In 2 Co 10¹⁶, referring to the same purpose to preach the gospel in 'the parts beyond,' which would include Rome and Spain, he used a different term—'line' (*κανών*). His resolution is fixed, but the time is not yet. 'Whosoever (*ώς ἀντεῖ*) I proceed to Spain' (Ro 15²⁴). 'For I hope on my passage through to see you and to have a send-off from you on my journey there.' Here he used a word (*διατορεύμενος*) which Polybius had used (iii. 68) of the legions that passed through Rome on their march to meet Hannibal. He also alludes to the Roman custom of escorting distinguished persons to their offices (*προπεμφθῆναι*). This term also conveys the temporary nature of his visit, and that his sphere of action lies beyond Rome. He is now proceeding with his collection (εὐλογία, 2 Co 9⁵) to Jerusalem; and lest they should be jealous, he adds, 'I shall make my way back through you to Spain, and am sure I shall come to you with a full blessing (εὐλογία) of Christ.' In Ac 19²¹, 'After I have been there (J) I must also see Rome,' he said nothing about this projected visit to Spain, not wishing to make the Ephesians jealous. They would have been more jealous of the visit to Spain than the Romans, the eastern markets being in keen competition with the western, which the Romans naturally favoured as Romanized. This may be the reason why nothing is recorded of Paul's visit to the West. We have to take into account not merely the jealousy of Gentile and Jew, but also the jealousy of Roman and Greek. The feeling against Greeks was intense in the Roman world in those days and later, and in Romanized districts like Spain and Gaul, and was heartily reciprocated by the Greeks, who refused to be Romanized.

When Paul wrote Ro 15 his idea was to return and visit Spain, taking Rome on the way. So far, he says, he has in preaching 'proceeded from Jerusalem round about, even to Illyricum' (v. 19), meaning that he has done his duty to the eastern portion of the Empire, and would now turn to the western. The question is, would Paul, whose

purpose had been delayed by two long periods of imprisonment, have carried out his plan when released? This assumes that he was released, an assumption based upon the following considerations:

(1) The Acts ends on a ringing note of optimism: 'proclaiming the kingdom of God and teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with complete liberty and without hindrance' (*μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας ἀκωλύτως*). How easy to add a short sentence regarding His death, if it happened. There were no reasons practical or political for silence. But, if release followed, it would be a well-known fact unnecessary to mention, for the writer intended to write a third volume, Ac 1¹, meaning 'the first' (*πρῶτον*) not 'the former' treatise. So at the end of Acts we stand on the verge of something new for Paul and the Church. Luke stops, like writers of serials, at a situation pregnant with life and interest. His clear-cut period of two completed years stands out in his memory against some background so important as to need a book for itself. He knew what happened.

(2) The precise way in which he mentions this period, 'he abode two whole years (*δύετερα δύη*) in his own hired house' (Ac 28³⁰), implies that after those two years he did not abide in his own hired house but had moved out of it. Where? This exact period corresponds with other fixed periods in Acts, e.g. 'a year and six months' (18¹¹), 'two years' (19¹⁰), 'two full years' (24²⁷). In all these places the aorist denotes that the period mentioned came to an end, and another began. The precise measurement of the period in question implies that something happened at the end. What? What would a Roman understand? Surely release. In the *Hecyra* of Terence (i. ii. 12) a woman says, 'I endured him for two complete years' (*biennium perpetuum*). She says nothing about release, but it is understood. As nothing is said to the contrary, we are entitled to infer a release here.

(3) What a splendid ending to Paul's story and conclusion to the Acts if Luke could have closed his records with an account of Paul's martyrdom, which would have suitably followed that of Stephen and James! Such a climax would have appealed to Luke's artistic sense, but instead he presents us

with the apostle's uncontrolled liberty of speech as his climax.

(4) What we think happened was this. When Paul was released after his trial, conditionally upon leaving Rome, Luke would have accompanied him to a port east or west of Rome, and then withdrawn to Philippi, and Paul was on his way to rejoin him in Macedonia when he begged Timothy to remain in Ephesus (1 Ti 1⁸). This would leave time for a visit to Spain or Gaul. For it would be unlike Paul to have ceased to feel the urge to preach in those parts after his release. If he failed to carry out his purpose—and he was nothing if not tenacious of purpose, e.g. in the collection—how can we explain the exultant note in 2 Ti 4¹⁷, ‘So that through me the message might be completely given, and all the nations might hear,’ if he failed to let the nations who collected in Rome hear? This phrase πάντα τὰ ἔθνη has here the same force that the ‘race of mortals’ or ‘the human race’ has in Tacitus, who used both expressions of the people of the empire; e.g. *Ann. xv. 44*, where speaking of the fire and the massacre he says the Christians were ‘condemned owing to the hatred of the *human race* for them’ (*odio humani generis*). Tacitus, a strict Roman, would certainly include the western half of the Empire, the Romanized portion, as well as the eastern. On what principle are we to exclude them from Paul’s summary?

(5) Paul’s optimism received no check during his imprisonment. In Ph 2¹⁷ he referred to his death as a remote possibility.¹ ‘Even supposing that I am offered up—which he rejects a few lines down—‘but I am confident in the Lord that I myself shall also shortly come’ (v. 24). See also Ph 1²⁶, Col 4⁷. And he requests Philemon to prepare him a lodging. At the end of the two years, we hear of nothing to damp his hopes. The Acts and Epistles sound the same note.

(6) In Ac 23¹¹ we have our Lord’s encouragement, ‘Cheer up, for, as thou didst testify concerning me in Jerusalem, thou must, in like manner, testify in (unto) Rome.’ The ὡς . . . οὕτως implies similarity of witness. This message meant Paul’s deliverance from Jews, why not similar deliverance from Romans. His first testimony was made before a tribunal, why should not the second be also before a tribunal? This appearance of Jesus made it impossible for the narrator to ignore the gloom of the apostle on his way to the city. Such anticipations as we find in Ac 20^{22f.} are no indication of his future, for they were dissipated by that

appearance. That message discounts the argument based upon Ac 20²⁵ against the second imprisonment.

Encircled by weeping friends and weeping himself, Paul used words he probably would not have uttered an hour before. He is going to Jerusalem, not knowing what bonds and troubles await him there, and adds, ‘I know that you shall no longer see my face, I mean all of you’ (οὐκέτι . . . οὐμεῖς πάντες). It is argued that this means that the Ephesians will never see him again. Supposing that the words can be so understood, why might not Paul have been mistaken? He was not infallible. Writing afterwards to Philemon and the Philippians he expressed a confident hope of release. Which of these was frustrated? One ambiguously reported by another person once, the other plainly expressed three times by himself, at a date much nearer the event. The expectation of release is surely the weightier. And the gloomy forebodings of Ac 20²⁵ and 21²³ are set aside by the cheering message of the Lord in 23¹⁴ and supply no basis for argument.

Moreover, the Greek words cannot bear the weight placed upon them. ‘Not again you all, shall see my face’ means ‘Some of you shall not see my face again’: cf. 2 Th 3², ‘faith is not the gift of all’ (οὐ πάντων), means ‘it is the gift of some, not of none’; 1 Co 15⁵¹, ‘We shall not all sleep’ does not mean ‘none of us shall sleep’; cf. Ac 10⁴⁰, etc. The next time some would be missing. Against this one doubtful saying we have many optimistic ones, e.g. Ph 1¹⁹, ‘I know that this will turn out to my salvation,’ the very words used in Job 13¹⁶ (LXX) to express Job’s certainty of the vindication of his character. So far, we have seen nothing to make the apostle give up his project. That he changed his plans is clear from his request to Philemon to secure him a lodging. But this does not imply that his plan of visiting the West was completely dropped. Neither is there anything to suggest a fatal termination to his first imprisonment.

But taking up 2 Tim., we sense a different situation and a different mood. Paul no longer has personal liberty. His friends no longer have easy access to him in his private lodging. He is in Rome again, but in a different locality, where his friend Onesiphorus found him with great difficulty (1¹⁷), and in need of comforts, loaded with a chain but without his cloak, books, and tablets which he had during his first captivity, in disgrace and prison as a *criminal* (*κακούργος*), such as a man charged with *majestas*, high treason, would be

¹ Jebb on *el kal, Edipus Tyrannus*, p. 296.

classed. What caused this change? A legal process called *endeixis*, instituted by one Alexander (iv. 14, 'Alexander laid *information* against me of many offences'). The LXX of Gn 50¹⁶ has caused the error of translating 'did me much evil.' Luke would have put that differently, Ac 9¹⁸, ἐποίησε, but here we have ἐνέδειξαρο.¹ The similar action taken against Apollonius, about this time, was introduced by an *endeixis*, and his trial or defence was called *apologia*, as Paul's is here. Apollonius, as guilty of *majestas*, was thrown among the *most criminal*; so Paul was treated as a *criminal* here. Although he has lost his cheerfulness, he shows the same philosophic spirit, 'I am reconciled' (*σπένδομαι*, Eurip. *Bacch.* 284).

In ch. 4 vv.¹⁴⁻¹⁷ imply acquittal after the first trial, re-arrest, and a second trial. The apostle is in a reminiscent mood all through the second Epistle, and relates certain details of the first trial which must have been known to Timothy in order to dispel his fears regarding the second. It is surely natural that in his second captivity he should recall the former. In our letters we are not always giving news. We often comment upon incidents well known to both parties. It is remarkable that we can set out in corresponding columns the accounts of the two trials Paul has stood:

1. 'In my first trial no man stood with me¹ (as witness), but all forsook me. May it not be laid to their account. But the Lord stood beside me² (as advocate) and strengthened me, and I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion, that through me the gospel might be fully proclaimed, and all the nations might hear' (vv. 16, 17) [this implies a complete deliverance, not a preliminary *actio* which would leave Paul within the lion's reach].

2. 'Demas forsook me. Only Luke is with me. Alexander the coppersmith laid many criminal charges against me. The Lord shall reward him according to his works. (Of whom do thou beware also, for he greatly withheld our words.) But the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work, and bring me safely into his heavenly kingdom' (vv. 9, 11, 14, 15, 18).

Vv.^{16, 17} are just another of Paul's many digressions. The present situation recalls the previous. Then the Lord befriended him in his isolation; now He will do the same. Alexander has re-

¹ Pollux, viii. 49, δέ ένδεικνύμενος πρὸς τὸν ἀρχοντα τὴν ἔνδειξιν ἀποφέρει.

² παρεγένετο of witnesses, παρέστη of advocate. See *Æschylus, Eumenides*, 367 and 65; cf. *adsum* and *adsto*.

cently opposed *our* arguments (as Paul never used 'our' of himself, this implies Luke's advocacy), but ever since the first trial all the nations have listened. Then the Lord delivered him out of the mouth of the lion, Nero, in order that he might bring the gospel to the whole Roman Empire, western as well as eastern. Now He will deliver him from every evil work of Alexander and bring him into his eternal kingdom. The passage is not only a digression, it contains an hyperbaton, or verbal misplacement, which Irenæus pointed out as a peculiarity of Paul in 2 Th 2⁸, etc. See also 1 Ti 1⁸, 'As I requested you, remain (*προσμεῖναι*)³ in Ephesus, when I was proceeding to Macedonia' (not ellipse).

The words, 'I was delivered out of the mouth of the lion' (*ἐρυσθην*, v. 17), have been attracted from their proper place, after the 'Lord gave me power,' to the following phrase, 'he shall deliver (*βύσται*) me,' both terms being used together in 2 Co 1¹⁰, 'he delivered us, and shall deliver.' The verb 'give power' is not followed by 'in order that' in the N.T., but 'deliver' is. That the words 'the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work' belong to the Alexander passage which refers to the second trial is clear from the exact *parallelismus*, even clearer in the Greek: 'The Lord will reward him according to his works'; 'The Lord will deliver me from every evil work.' This study in contrasts belongs to the Alexander passage. There are many discordant notes in the last page of the Pastorals which may be resolved by the explanation of a second trial. The preliminary character of the second trial is required to explain other points (we have such preliminary trials in the *Life of Apollonius* by Philostratus, who calls them *προαγών*), for Paul has not yet received his sentence. But he knew it would not be long delayed. So he asked Timothy twice at the end of this letter, which had been written some time, but to which he added a postscript—the first place Timothy would study for instructions—adding some news and comments and urging him to 'hurry'—'hurry before the winter.' There must have been something said at the preliminary examination to convince him that the final trial, when the sentence would be given, would take place before that winter. He may also have required his books and tablets for the last stage of his second trial. There would then be a gap of four years between the acquittal in 2 Ti 4¹⁷, 'I was delivered from the mouth of the lion,' and the hour of his dictating the words, 'the Lord shall deliver me from every evil work,' an

³ Infinitive for Imperative; cf. Ph 3¹⁶, στοχεῖν.

hour when Paul could truly say, 'my life-work has been accomplished. The gospel has been fully and widely preached, and *all* the nations, that is the western as well as the eastern portions of the Roman Empire, have heard.'

Many other features in the Pastorals fall into line with this suggestion. Alexander's fierce hostility to *our arguments* implies that on this occasion Paul had a companion, evidently Luke—'only Luke is with me'—to assist him. It is clear, then, that his opposition was shown to the pleadings of Paul and the evidence of Luke at the second trial. There would be no point in referring to such hostility at the first apologia, when Paul was without Luke's help and when the apostle was tried concerning specific charges entered on the *elogium* or charge sheet; and upon which no fresh charge could be entered. Alexander's appearance on the scene shows that it was a different trial. It was through his information that Paul had been arrested and brought a second time before the Emperor's court. His activities were still to be feared. He could still do Timothy harm if he was not careful. It was probably because Timothy had not exercised discretion regarding him that Paul was in his present trouble and had to say, 'of him do thou also beware' (v.15). Something had been done that had made Alexander intensely angry. We find in the first Epistle (1²⁰) mention of 'Hymenæus and Alexander, whom I am handing over to Satan,'¹ that they may be taught not to blaspheme.' Some tactless use of that remark by Timothy, who was inclined to scold (1 Ti 5¹), brought this trouble upon the apostle. That that Alexander is the man in the text is quite probable. In the former passage there was no need to mention his trade as he is coupled with Hymenæus, a well-known leader of the opposition mentioned in both Epistles (1 Ti 1²⁰, 2 Ti 2¹⁷). But in the second passage his trade is specified to prevent

confusion with another innocent Alexander. We have a parallel case in Ac 10¹⁷ and 10³³. In the first passage we have 'the house of Simon,' in the second 'the house of Simon the tanner.' Alexander's opportunity came, for just before the words which provoked him was a passage which could be construed as a personal attack upon the Emperor (1 Ti 1⁸⁻¹⁰), containing among many other opprobrious epithets which fitted Nero like a glove the one word that above all names he detested—*matricide*—only here in the Bible. This was Nero's 'constant epithet.' For using that word he punished people severely, and afterwards was to visit Delphi with his fury because of the oracle's reference to his crime. Now if Apollonius was impeached for high treason and impiety against Nero for saying 'pardon the gods for taking pleasure in buffoons'²—a reference to Nero—how much more likely would Paul (if he was informed against, and in those days Tacitus and Philostratus assure us there was not even liberty to converse or correspond) be charged with that offence. In days when 'no house could keep a secret,' when Apollonius dreaded to put his thoughts on paper, when a man's face was watched as well as his mouth, the apostle was courting death when he wrote that passage about the law not being made for a righteous man (like him), *but for unrighteous men* (like Nero) who had broken every law in the Roman calendar and claimed as Emperor to be above the Law (*lege solius*), expressly mentioning the crime of *matricide*, as well as other crimes Nero regarded as accomplishments. That Alexander acted as informer is also brought out by the word 'reward,' for Nero's rewards for informers were fabulous, and included a portion of their victim's estate. Paul's estate was small, but his Lord would see to it that Alexander had his reward—a truly Pauline remark.

¹ παρέδωκα, epistolary aorist.

² Philostratus, iv. 47.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Greediness.

BY THE REVEREND F. J. ASHLEY, JOHANNESBURG.

'The snare is laid for him in the ground, and a trap for him in the way.'—Job 18¹⁰.

I SUPPOSE when you visit the Zoo some of the best fun you get is feeding the monkeys, and, of course,

it seems quite the right thing that what they like best is monkey-nuts. Aren't they quick to catch them? and don't they get the shells off them cleverly? and all the time keeping their eyes on you, hoping for more.

But aren't they greedy? If you throw two or three nuts one after another to a monkey quickly, he does not wait to crack and eat the first, but claps them one after the other into his mouth, till

his cheeks are bulging with them. Does anything look more comical ?

Have you ever wondered how monkeys are caught ? They are very watchful and quick, and once they get into the trees it is hopeless going after them. Well, let me tell you how some native boys catch them, and they are able to do so because they know monkeys are greedy.

A boy will take a melon or pumpkin, cut a small hole in the top, hollow out the inside and fasten the stem to the ground where he knows the monkeys come ; inside the pumpkin he puts something that rattles, a bright piece of glass or metal, and then goes and hides in the long grass. And presently here come the monkeys, chattering and playing about, and one of them knocks the pumpkin over, hears the rattle, and, wondering what that is, grabs the pumpkin, sees the hole and peeps.

Then, oh my ! he's as pleased as Jacky Horner with his pie, and in goes his hand. And as soon as the native boy sees him do that, up he gets and walks up to the monkey ; does not run, or stalk him, just walks straight up to him ; he knows he's got that monkey.

Why ? Well, you see, the hole in the top of the pumpkin is made just big enough for a monkey to squeeze his paws into with the fingers straight out, but when his fist is doubled up with that gaudy thing he wants so badly inside it, it is quite impossible for him to pull out his paw. And, of course, the pumpkin is fastened to the peg in the ground.

'Well,' you say, 'why doesn't he let it go ?'

Ah, but that is just what he will not do on any account. He jabbers away with fright, pulls and tugs at the pumpkin, scratches and bites, but he *will not let go*. And the native boy knows he won't, just as he knows a dog will not let go of his bone. So that is why he calmly walks up to the monkey, picks him up by the scruff of his neck, smacks him to make him quiet, and carries him off to sell him to a white man. All because he's greedy.

Now Paul tells us in one of his letters to 'covet earnestly the best things.' And they have this virtue, that though we want them for ourselves, we also want to share them. Half the pleasure in having a good book is to say to some one else, 'Here, read this. You'll like it.'

What is more, we can only appreciate the best things by definitely making up our minds not to want the bad things. If we go after the bad things we are sure to be badly caught in the end. For what happens then is that we get into bad company, form bad habits and become the slaves of them. If you know any one who cannot leave

strong drink alone, who gambles, you know some one who has been caught in a trap. Again I say to you, don't be greedy and selfish, then you will have no source of weakness in yourself, but rather be a strength to your friends. And I need hardly add that the best way to achieve this is by following our Lord faithfully.

Jim Gardner, V.C. : An Armistice Talk.

BY THE REVEREND E. HARDEE MERCHANT, B.A.,
B.D., LIVERPOOL.

'A good soldier of Jesus Christ.'—2 Ti 2³.

The most wonderful and romantic position in any church is that of the organ-blower. He has a little castle all to himself. There he works, away from all observers, in a kind of splendid loneliness. There is a screen which prevents any members of the congregation seeing him. And what goes on there we can never know. The other day some church officers had occasion to go behind to the place where the blower sits. Something was being done to the organ, and they were walking round. They were amused to find that for years the various organ-blowers had pencilled their names on the woodwork, so that it was possible to get a history of the organ-blowers from the pencilled record. But these youngsters had not been satisfied with writing only their names, they had covered themselves with glory by adding various titles of honour. One of them was especially prominent, ' Jim Gardner, V.C.'

That is one of the advantages of youth. You can write anything after your name. All the professions are open to you. You can have only one of them, of course, but the choice is yours. Any of the various trades are open. And it is not a matter for wonder that boys and girls change so often as they do, when there is such a dazzling choice open to them. Some of the decisions are not so changeable as people think. A boy I know wants to be a minister. He talks about it every day. One day a doctor of great charm visited his house, and since that day the boy has talked a great deal about becoming a doctor. You understand he has not really changed his mind at all. He is probably going to be a medical missionary.

For just a few years all the world is open to you, and you show people what your characters are like by the opinions you express.

Suppose you think now to yourselves what you are going to become in the next few years. Some of you are going to College and in imagination you

are writing various degrees after your names. It will mean a great deal of work to realize your dreams, but still, you are making a start.

What if you were now to write down your ambitions and to hand the papers up to the pulpit? They would be very interesting. It would be very sad, of course, if none of you had thought of doing anything for the good of other people and if your papers were entirely devoted to your own honour and success. That is the first and last danger of planning, that our plans should be so narrow that no one else gets a share in what we hope to do. I think we will manage to avoid that.

When I first knew Jim Gardner it was many years after he had written on the organ. I met him first on the evening he arrived home from France after serving in the Army. His soldiering was ended, and he would soon be going back to his ordinary work. He was not a V.C., but he had done the work of a real man, and his record was that of hundreds of thousands of men who had in all simplicity done their duty. He had fulfilled the spirit of his boyish dreams.

It is a terrible thing when the letters we write after our names at the beginning never work out in our lives. One boy was taught at school to play for his side and not to think too much about his own honour. That is a promising start, with the hope of an unselfish life. But the boy forgot, and when he became a man he lived only for himself and often hindered others and made life more difficult for them. Perhaps it was a girl who planned to do a lot of good when she became bigger. But as the girl grew older she began to think of more selfish things. This girl studied being more grandly dressed than others rather than how to give people a little help. People admired her, but she was really only a very selfish person. There had been beautiful dreams, but they had not worked out.

So I like to think of Jim Gardner, who did his duty and made good.

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Religion and Common Sense.

'But we beseech you, brethren, that ye study . . . to work with your own hands. . . . Of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. . . . Let us, who are of the day, be sober, putting on . . . for an helmet, the hope of salvation.'—
1 Th 4¹⁰, 5¹⁻⁸.

The Apostle Paul had at least one consolation in his difficulties. His churches were founded

amongst people so diverse in race and temperament—Jews, Greeks, Celts, and solid Romans—that he found himself engaged in the solution of new problems, as well as old ones, wherever he went. Whatever he could complain of, he could not complain of monotony in his ecclesiastical labours.

The Church at Thessalonica, not to break this uniformity of difference, had a peculiar tendency of its own to put all its emphasis of interest on the doctrines of the 'last things.'

That attitude of mind had two results :

It tended to divorce their religious thought and interest from their religious experience. By putting emphasis on the doctrines of the last things, it tended to shift the emphasis from the great doctrines of forgiveness and the indwelling spirit, which are the theological counterparts of a man's present religious life, if it is a Christian one, and, therefore, are the doctrines of chiefest practical importance.

It tended secondly to make them impatient of the 'daily round, the common task.' Ordinary duties became very ordinary in the brightness of the expectancy of Christ's coming; and those who had to perform them grew contemptuous of them. There was nothing for them to do, they thought, but wait a day or two—or if He should delay His coming yet awhile, a day or two more—and then the sudden light, and the establishment of a new earth. Thus they tended to divorce their thinking from ordinary practical duty, as well as to take the emphasis off the religion of experience.

To these friends of his the Apostle gave two pieces of advice. The first was to go on working, even though the Lord was at hand. Let us remember that the Apostle said that, and thought that; and that the value of his advice is only heightened by the fact that he himself expected the quick coming of Christ. On the other hand, he advised them (though not so explicitly) to recognize the extent of Christian ignorance and confidence. 'Ye yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord cometh as a thief in the night.' That is to say, 'though we expect it soon, ye know perfectly well that ye know nothing about it.' But, 'our God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation, by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him.' That is to say, there is something that you *do* know. And what you know is enough.

In these two instructions, two points are suggested for our consideration :

The ordinary active life is not opposed to the religious life.

When the barriers of Christian ignorance are frankly acknowledged, we find that we know enough generously to support, at their height, the lives which God has given us.

1. In the first place, then, Paul urges, and especially upon those anxious for electric religious uplift, the duty and value of the daily task.

Not the least service our ordinary routine does us is its splendid defensive quality against our own faculty of thought. Set a man entirely loose from present occupation, and his will need to be a mind extraordinarily ruled of Christ, if it is to keep its peace. 'The devices and desires' would be at him ; and he, although the grace of God is wonderful indeed, would be defenceless against them. Wherefore the Almighty gives him work to do. It takes him, say, ten hours in the day ; and planning for to-morrow fills a good many of the rest. Really, God treats us as we need, which is like children. We get fretful, and ask unmanly questions, and the great, kind Father hands us a spade, and says, 'Go, dig' ; or a pen, and says, 'Go, write ; and forget the questions for a little.' If we still rebel, a great voice, speaking clear and loud through Nature, and with a poignant tenderness from the Cross, cries unto us, 'Work and trust.' And if we hearken, a very gracious whisper comes, 'What ye know not now, ye shall know hereafter.'

Furthermore, it is our daily task that forces us into large human relations. If, in the first instance, it serves to save us from ourselves, in the second, it gives us the opportunity of fulfilling the law of Christ, which is to bear one another's burdens. It not only defends us, but it helps us to grow.

Now, the family and the social circle aid in the same way ; but, for many of us, it is our daily task that chiefly aids. It forces us to live not where we would, but where we can. It brings us into touch with all sorts and conditions of men. It forces us to see a good deal of the burden and sorrow of life. A man free from daily duty is in horrible danger of creating a palace of delight for himself. If he has not to pursue duty, the chances are that he will pursue pleasure, not necessarily in any ignoble sense. Himself free from life's stress he does not want to see it, so he puts himself in fair surroundings, selects the most congenial companions, and lets the world go by—or at least that section of it which is ugly and uncongenial, and, above all, that section which is at all suggestive of tears. That is not in the least an unfair description of a good many 'independent' men.

The daily task also develops the simple power of going on. The very monotony of things, rightly used, helps. The same things have to be done every day. But, when they are done, and against the grain, one thing more has been gained than their accomplishment. The worker has developed in that splendid power of patience, wherein, so Jesus says, men win their lives.

Wherefore, we reject with strong emphasis the thought of worthy Christian people, who find the daily task a barrier to their knowledge of God. On the contrary, it is one of God's great ministries ; for it advances the knowledge of the good. And the good is God. At the same time it was religious folk who were working. If a man shuts God out of his life, on the 'God-has-nothing-to-do-with-business' principle, he is not likely to gain great comfort. A man must soak his work in a great thought of God, doing those things that are honest to his own conscience, before, slowly, he may find his duty an instrument for bringing him into the kingdom of righteousness, peace, and joy.

2. Ay ! but it is hard, even so, to go on knowing little of beginnings and endings. It is hard to continue in the dark. But is it so dark that we cannot divine ? The times and seasons are, indeed, hidden. Let us be frank and honest about it. Let us admit that we do not know what we do not know. But let us be equally emphatic about what we do know. We *can* mark an extraordinary Power making for righteousness. We *can* learn of a great Beneficence making for peace. These facts are there to be tested by experience. We *can* discern the Father. Wherefore let us on with the helmet of good hope. 'Fear not, little flock ; it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.'¹

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Pathfinder.

'I will instruct thee and teach thee in the way which thou shalt go : I will counsel thee with mine eye upon thee.'—Ps 32⁸ (R.V.).

When an expedition sets forth on the deserts of Cathay, with all its uncertainties, the natives greet the departing caravan with a farewell shout, 'May there be a road !'

Contemplating great national movements we come to believe in 'the man and the hour' ; that the man and the juncture arrive together, and that his joy and glory are bound up with his devotion

¹ J. R. P. Slater, *The Enterprise of Life*, 201.

to the cause for the success of which he came into the world. But this is not only true for the elect few who are destined to control imperial movements ; we believe it is equally so as it concerns all men. Of course, the harmony is not so palpably manifest in the case of the ordinary individual as in that of the famous historical actor, but we are compelled to believe it equally true. There is a particular line of life drawn by God's finger, along which we best realize ourselves, most effectually serve society, and most assuredly attain life's great end.

This conception of life implies the tremendous truth that the ordained path may be missed. Migrating birds occasionally lose their way. From one cause or another instinct fails, or is thwarted, and the creature strays into an unfamiliar region in which it is supremely unhappy. The human being is liable to the same misfortune. 'As a bird that wandereth from her nest, so is a man that wandereth from his place' (Pr 27⁸). The scientist tells that, so far as Nature is concerned, we live in a world of fitnesses, that we have to search to find misfits, and when we think that we have found them, we have generally made a mistake. How different it appears when we turn to society !

What are the reflections suggested by this state of things ?

1. *The necessity of supernatural direction* is forced upon us. 'O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself : it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps' (Jer 10²³). 'Education is the discerner of men,' writes Ruskin ; and undoubtedly true education reveals latent intellectual qualities and aptitudes, so tending directly to reduce the disharmonies of society, only it is more easy to discern men than to place them. Now psychology, striking deeper still, sets itself to decipher the subtle hieroglyphics inscribed in the constitution of every fresh being, and to adjudge them the niche they can best fill. Finally, we congratulate ourselves that in the absence of the instinct of direction possessed by bird and beast, we enjoy the faculty of reason by which we are supposed to detect and evade every false way. Yet, at last, we are conscious that in spite of all our gifts and expedients, our utmost worldly wisdom, we are unequal to the vast experiment of living, of choosing the best way, of so directing our steps as to answer life's great end. Something more is required for the full realization of the Divine design than what the most richly-gifted possess. In a word, to compass the Divine design we need Divine illumination.

2. The aim of the Divine leading must be kept

in view. The goal that we propose is not always that designed by God. We become the victims of false ideals, and are apt to conclude that we are on the right path only when it leads to temporal enjoyment and aggrandizement. Anatole France writes : 'When the road is strewn with flowers, do not ask whether it leads.' Pleasure is to be accepted as the end of life, and we are to infer that we have chosen the right road when it is strewn with roses. A Sanscrit proverb sounds a better note, still far from the whole truth, 'That is the road which is trodden by the great.' That is, we are to regard wealth, greatness, and glory, as the reigning ideals, and to be satisfied only whilst we find ourselves on the paths promising splendid prizes. But these are not the objects proposed by the government of God. 'For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways,' saith the Lord. Circumstances are only means to the end, however splendid they may appear ; the end contemplated is that through discipline the spiritual powers of the redeemed are brought to light and glorious action.

'I am the light of the world : he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life' (Jn 8¹²). The King's highroad is 'the way of holiness' ; the path bearing the footprints of the Greatest. His path was not always strewn with flowers, far from it, but we know that even when stained by blood it was the royal road.

We are apt to think that whilst the worldly lot agrees with our constitutional trend, and events move smoothly, we are in the providential way, but as soon as friction sets in we imagine ourselves on a wrong course. It is, in fact, God's larger, higher purpose crossing our inferior thought and ambition. For the highest end Nature itself must be suspended, contradicted, varied, or sacrificed. 'There is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death' (Pr 14¹²). May we not say that there is a way which seemeth wrong unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of life ? God's transcending control contradicts, for the time and occasion at least, what seems most agreeable with natural happiness and social welfare. The distasteful task, the uncongenial society, the discordant marriage, the hateful neighbourhood, appear so many unfortunate associations, and yet may better serve our highest interest than the smooth, the pleasant, the successful. The unfitness of the worldly environment enhances the spiritual life.

3. *To identify ourselves with the Divine purpose* is the security of life. 'Teach me thy way, O

Lord' (Ps 27¹¹). Unamuno writes: 'Goodness is the best source of spiritual clear-sightedness.' If a man has faith in God, joined to a life of purity, and moral elevation, his sense of the right, the true, the safe, will be unfailing. The Spirit of God enhances the normal perceptions and judgment of such, and in the bewildering hour light arises in the darkness. He who is sincere and inspired, the golden lamp of revelation in his hand, the light of the Spirit in his heart, finds life no erratic pilgrimage, tortured and despairing. In deepest eclipse may he confidently affirm: 'But he knoweth the way that I take; when he hath tried me, I shall come forth as gold. My foot hath held fast to his steps; his way have I kept, and turned not aside' (Job 23^{10f}).

What a sense of strength and serenity does the knowledge of God's leadership impart! 'I will counsel thee with mine eye upon thee.' It is great indeed to live in the care of the living God, not to be left to abstract laws and precepts, to prudence and policy, to the wisdom of the world. It is sweet to know that in life and death He is ever, in His own way, drawing us to Himself.

If we are to enjoy this sense of protection how carefully must we guard the sensitiveness of the soul, so that we may discern the Divine impulse! James Sully tells this story of a German musician who was a friend of his: 'He was of so nicely balanced a nervous organization that once when I asked him to play a piece of Schumann just after smoking a cigarette, he declined in a shocked sort of way.' If, then, a narcotic particle can disqualify an artist for high music, what care must we give for the preservation of our spiritual sensibility!¹

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Things that remain.

'Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain.'—Rev 3².

There is a certain sad comfort in being reminded that the Christian Church began to fall from grace while a father could still tell his son the story of Pentecost as an eye and ear witness. The glory of Sardis, the city, was already gone when the letter to the seven churches was written. Now there is nothing left of the city but dim memories and two lonely columns of a pagan temple, and nothing is left of the church save the message which rebuked and assured it; but one phrase of that message haunts us still with its pathetic testimony to the

¹ W. L. Watkinson, *The Stability of the Spiritual*, 59.

transient estate of all human things and its terse insistence upon the duty of strongly maintaining what is left: 'Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain.' All the wearing tides of time and our power to stand against them meet in these eight words. I spent the end of a cloudless afternoon last summer about the Roman amphitheatre at Nîmes, says Dr. Gaius Glenn Atkins of Auburn Theological Seminary, New York. Its ellipse is still complete, its arches are unbroken, its stone seats can still be used. But time had clothed it with an indefinable sense of things done and ended. Marcus Aurelius may have seen its foundations laid. The Vandals had explored its passages. The Goths had made a fortress of it. The Saracens had held it for a little till Karl Martell drove them out. It had echoed the songs of Troubadours and, possibly, the prayers of embattled French Protestantism, and now of all such far-off unhappy things as these it alone was left. And in a slow, careful way Nîmes or France was strengthening what remained. There were workmen's tools and builders' materials stored in archways the gladiators had used. Old columns had new capitols, there were fresh-cut stones where old stones had fallen out as though they could no longer bear any weight at all. The very sound of the craftsmen's hammer re-echoed the insistence of our text—'Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain.'

Let us consider all this as it bears upon our own estate and duty.

1. Be watchful, and *strengthen the things which have remained*. It is every man's fate to live amongst the remains of his idealisms and keep intact only a part—and often the lesser part—of the brave confidence with which he set out. Life is not kind to dreams and tries the temper of our ideals with disillusioning experience. We bring no love unworn to life's midmost heights, nor any goodness unstained, nor any faith across which the chill shadow of doubt has not sometimes fallen. What shall we do, then, with what is left? Dismiss what we have kept because it seems so inconsequential compared with what we have lost, and, because so much is gone, let what remains go also? By no means. What is left has a force only the strongly tested can possibly possess. Whatever endures is deeply rooted in some element of reality.

The hearthstone love which has outlasted the friction of intimate daily comradeship, the quiet blessed friendly warmth of it is worth more than any love that went out shining and untried to meet the dawn. We may begin with all the faith of all the creeds, and end with a bare handgrip on God

that is always slipping and never slips, and that last unbroken strand of faith, which no brute fact has broken nor any acid experience dissolved, will prove the power to link our soul to the Eternal. Whatever goodness we have achieved and kept through temptation and moral failure and the wreck of resolution, has a fire-tested quality to make it the corner-stone of a goodness for which evil will have no allure and against which the gates of hell cannot prevail.

We are not asked to strengthen the faith with which we began, rehabilitate the undisciplined characters of the banished years, recapture the ardour of some pristine love. We whom time has tried are asked only to begin with what is left. 'Red Rust' is the story of a handful of seed wheat. The hero—if the sad son of a Swedish immigrant can ever be a hero—lived a poor, bare life. But he was mind-kin and soul-kin to the great scientists. He puzzled out for himself, with a gleam from Darwin and a hint from somewhere else, the secret of plant-breeding. He saw successive harvests, which might have eased a little the cruel pressure of poverty, ruined, sometimes by frost, sometimes by drought, sometimes in a summer night by red rust, and he gave his life to find a grain to suit the climate and the soil. He saved what was left after each disaster. He sent to Sweden for wheat which his father remembered to have ripened in a short northern summer. He crossed the seed which lived through a rainless season with the seed that ripened before the frost came. He saved a dozen heads of wheat from a rust-ruined field, crossed his handful once more, created a new grain from scanty harvests sifted by the years and heat and frost and rust, and left to the north-west the seed wheat of the world's bread. He had strengthened the things that had remained; they made the future rich.

2. Be watchful, and *strengthen the things that should remain*. Even the time-tested is not always the time-approved. Whatever endures has both meaning and power, but not always by the truest tests enduring value. We are by the grace of God judges and dividers. Whatever has outlasted the discipline of time and the correction of experience passes in review before us while we, with our own consent, renew its ancient leasehold over our souls and society or forbid its further empire. Nay, this freighted current of the years does not pass before us; it passes through us. It uses our wills and our affections for its channelled way. Our judgments are the sceptres which the past extends over the future, our resolutions furnish what would

otherwise be an army of ghosts with weapons to conquer by. These things, whose right to rule has long since been forfeited, have neither body, voice, nor weapon till they have won us and made us their tools.

It belongs to youth to assert itself against what ought not to endure any longer, and to bring its gallant and unwasted force to the support of all those things which ought to endure. In this use of the text the emphasis falls strongly upon the cautioning phrase. Be watchful—moral alertness is a very necessary virtue. Those unworthy claimants for a future which would be far better without them are unsleeping. They solicit us in the guise of our own interests and destinies; they spread abroad to all the winds banners of pride and patriotism and plead an immemorial usage. They support themselves with the sanctity of dear association. It is never an easy thing to disentangle the strangely mingled fabrics of life.

The ageless associations of valour and loyalty with war must be undone—and valour and loyalty furnished with a more humane and righteous support. There has always been a star-dust glory to light the black horror of a battlefield with the intimations of what we are able to do and bear and give when life itself is dedicated to the hazard of a great cause. We still need to take star dust and use it to make the securities of peace as splendid as the risks of war. Our religion is entangled with old survivals and older supports. Some of them can be changed to meet new needs of more discerning spirits, others have served their purpose, and others still are becoming a positive hindrance, and yet, like the weathering wall, they are penetrated by the tendrils of some living growth of faith and devotion. It will need a sure and delicate touch to feel among all the tendrils of the soul and, without fatally wounding them, attach them to new supports or feed them with a force to stand alone. That is the task of the ministry of the next generation if religion is to increase its growth. Be watchful—but be tender and patient too.

And be intelligent. This whole great process of strengthening the things that should remain involves a rare quality of moral judgment. We have to judge not only the certainly wrong—which is easy—but all the things more or less colourless in themselves and having no moral value, save in their relation to vaster and more significant interests—which is desperately difficult. From our own dearly bought point of vision we see now how often humanity has contended for the dust and missed the strategic heights which have commanded their

future. We need to choose for survival always with a far vision. And lest so great a mandate should seem to have no meaning for the most of us, let us remember that we are never doing anything else than choosing the things that shall remain. Our choices and our visions, our obediences and rebellions, our lives and loyalties, our labours and wearinesses are all aspects of an eternal process.

3. Finally, *strengthen the things that do remain.* So far, our own lonely responsibilities have been urged as though there was no seat of judgment above our own, no court of final appeal; as though we ourselves could create the enduring by choosing it. There was never a stranger mingling of truth and fallacy. We do not really determine what shall endure. That is, in the nature of things, an aspect of eternal reality, the undergirding power of God. We only choose whether our days and our ways shall fall in with the current of the abiding, or, in the majestic phrase of Bossuet, be caught in the current of the transient and carried down into the abyss of oblivion. For there are two currents whose flow we can trace through all the experiences of our humanity. They use the same channels, they seem to reflect the same lights. And yet give them a vast enough reach and one vanishes and one endures. St. Paul saw the marble-crowned Acropolis in all its mellow-pillared perfectness. He saw Nero's Golden House and Imperial standards above mailed legions. He heard the echoes of Platonic philosophy in the streets of Athens, and Rabbinic lore in the streets of Jerusalem, and he saw the shadow of doom across them all.

In one inspired moment he saw the ultimate issues, the undergirding realities so near they beat with his pulse, so strong they carried him toward their own timeless ends. 'Now abideth faith and hope and love.' That is all. Here are the ultimate tests of every issue which demands our suffrage, every cause which asks our permission to go on. Are they in the direction of faith and hope and love? Do they establish our confidence in those things which, though unseen, are the enduring? Do they fill the world with a braver expectation of an outcome worth the cost of life to man and to God? Do they make love more real and more commanding? Let us choose them, then, and make our own souls their support and guard. We must lose ourselves in something—or else we shall never find ourselves at all. But no man can perish who loses himself in the abiding. Be watchful and strengthen the things that remain.¹

¹ G. G. Atkins in *Christian World Pulpit*, cxv. 90.

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Unity of the Race: An Armistice Sermon.

'One God and Father of all.'—Eph 4⁶.

1. It is about the Church—the great Church, the total Church—that the Apostle is speaking when he uses the words 'One God and Father of all.' That great Church had its local manifestations, for already Christianity had gained a footing in places as far apart as Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome. In all these places Christian churches—local fellowships—had been formed. These local churches differed amongst themselves in method and practice and polity, but, in spite of all their external differences, they together formed one 'body,' and knew themselves to be one great Church, because, whether in Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Rome, or Jerusalem, they had one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father.

It is, therefore, quite clear that it is of God's relationship to the Christian people that these words were originally written. All Christian people are one because they have one God and Father. But while God is Father to believing people in a special and intimate way, He is also the Father of all mankind. Our Lord speaks of God as Father in that inclusive and universal sense. In the case of the Christian the filial relationship to God is a *realized* relationship; in the case of non-believing people it is an *unrealized* relationship. As Dr. Dale used to put it: 'God is the Father of all men, but all men are not sons.' But the fact that a relationship is not realized does not affect the fact that such a relationship exists. The universal Fatherhood of God is a New Testament truth. So that, while we may be departing slightly from the original application of the phrase of the text, we shall certainly not be travelling beyond the orbit of Christian truth, if we use it as descriptive of God's relationship to the whole of mankind, and find the ultimate ground for belief in the unity of the race, and justification for our faith that the race will one day realize itself as 'one body' in the great fact that there is 'one God and Father of us all.'

2. The revelation that God was One, and that He was the Only, was one of the most tremendous truths ever flashed into the mind of man. It has profoundly affected thought and practical life. It has had certain great and momentous consequences.

To begin with, it has given us a universe, a cosmos, a rational and intelligible world. There could be no *universe* if various gods were at work in this world of ours, prosecuting their own plans

and furthering their own purposes. That accounts for the sigh of relief with which—according to Dr. Glover—an educated Japanese welcomed the proclamation of the Christian gospel. ‘One God,’ he exclaimed, ‘not eight millions; that was joyful news to me.’ One of the regulative ideas of our time is that of the uniformity of Nature. There is nothing accidental or haphazard or casual about Nature—Nature can be depended on. Astronomers, for example, can forecast to the minute the coming of an eclipse. But what is the uniformity of Nature but the scientific aspect of the unity of God? We have a world which we can decipher and understand, a universe and not a chaos, because behind all Nature’s phenomena there is a Mind, a single Mind; because God, one God, works all and in all.

One God, one law, one element,
And one far-off divine event,
To which the whole creation moves.

But it all starts with the ‘one God.’ ‘One law’ because there is ‘one God.’

And as it makes our world a universe, so it justifies us in believing there is meaning and purpose in life—the life both of the individual and of the world. To believe in a multitude of gods, playing at cross-purposes, using men and women as pawns in their game, is to reduce life to a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. We are able to believe that things work together for good only because we believe there is one God at work, and He a good and loving God. And we are able to believe that, in spite of delays and set-backs and reactions, there is some ‘far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves’ only because we believe in One God, One Sovereign Lord steadily bringing to pass His own chosen and determined purpose.

And, further, the unity of God carries with it the unity of the race. Humanity is one wherever we find it. It is one in spite of differences of colour and physiognomy and speech. It is one in spite of the vast differences in development which separate the child races of Africa and the South Seas from the finished product of Western civilization—one because created by the same God, with fundamentally the same feelings and instincts and aspirations. ‘We are His offspring!’ All men can make that great and stupendous statement.

3. Our Lord, in His teaching about God, built upon the foundations laid by the prophets. He started from this great truth—the climax of the prophetic revelation: that God was One and that

He was good and holy—but He added another truth to it, a truth about the *nature* of God, a truth which has transfigured our very conception of God, and given us a God whom we cannot only fear and reverence, but love. ‘And Father,’ that is the addition Jesus made. St. Paul could never have penned the brief sentence of the text, had he not sat at the feet of Christ and learned of Him. ‘One God and *Father!*’ The fact that God is One carries with it the truth of the unity of the race. But this further truth, which our Lord revealed, makes of our race something warmer and more intimate than a unity: it makes it a family.

Now, the Fatherhood of God has become an accepted truth, at any rate amongst Christian nations. But the consequential truth of the unity of the race, of the real brotherhood of men, still waits for a practical acceptance.¹

Here on the Sunday before Armistice Day we are called to remember our dead:

What shall we give to the men who have died?
Order or cross for their mourners’ pride?
Can the dead so cheaply be satisfied?

What shall we do for these gallant dead?
To the widow money, to the children bread?
Can this debt be paid at so much a head?

What shall we give to the men who have died?
What guerdon asks the Crucified?
That His friends bear fruit and the fruit abide.²

‘Brethren, we are debtors.’ Do we believe that God meant the human race, of all nations and kindreds and peoples and tongues, to be a family, one family under one Father—God? If we do, then why don’t we get busy making it so?

‘Peace is proclaimed,’ said M. Briand in his impassioned speech before the signing of the Kellogg Pact; ‘it is well: it is much. But it still remains necessary to organize it. In the solution of difficulties, *right*, and not might, must prevail.

‘That is to be the work of to-morrow. At this unforgettable hour the conscience of the peoples, pure and rid of all national selfishness, is sincerely endeavouring to attain these serene regions where human *brotherhood* can be felt in the beatings of one and the same heart. Let us seek a common idea within which we can all merge our fervent hopes and give up any selfish thoughts. As there is not one of the nations represented here but has shed her blood in the last war, I propose that we

¹ J. D. Jones, *The Inevitable Christ*, 183.

² A. W. Pollard.

should dedicate to the dead, to all the dead of the Great War, the event which we are going to consecrate together by our signatures.'

On Tuesday, the 3rd of September this year, the Prime Minister took a further step in the organizing of peace when he announced to the Assembly of the League of Nations at Geneva that the optional clause of the Hague Statute was to be signed by England. Referring to the Kellogg Peace Pact for the renunciation of war, the Prime Minister said that the British Government, and he was sure everybody else, was desirous that the Pact should not merely be a declaration on paper, but should be translated into constitutions and institutions that will work for the peace of the world.

But institutions, we know, are not enough. The League of Nations deserves the eager and prayerful support of all Christian people, because it aims at preventing a recurrence of war. It has already accomplished much, and has thereby placed the world in its debt. But the truth is, the League of Nations, in and of itself, is insufficient to guarantee the world's peace. Behind it, if it is to be effective, there must be a mind, a public mind, and it must be a new mind. Was it not Monsieur Briand who said that before disarmament could become a practical policy there would have to be a 'disarmament of the mind'? That is true! But we need something more radical even than a disarmament of the mind; we want the creation of a *new* mind. Men act as they think. If they think in terms of a nation's interests and supposed prestige, they will act as nations, and that is certain to mean antagonism and strife. Not until they think in terms of the race will the peace of the world be secure. Our Lord was always insisting upon the new mind, or the 'new heart' as He expressed it.

And how shall men get this 'new mind,' this 'new heart'? Well, the regular meeting of the representatives of the various nations in the

Assembly of the League is doing something to create it. But it is only Jesus Christ who can really give it. As men learn of Him, receive His Spirit, they get new outlooks, new ideals, new motives, new inspirations. They are literally 'born again.' When Christ is truly received, He gives men the new mind, He abolishes the enmities, and teaches men to love one another. This is not mere theorizing. History affirms the truth of it. There was no fiercer or more vehement nationalist than the Apostle Paul was in his early days. He was a Hebrew of the Hebrews. But, when Christ was born in him, he got a new mind. All his Jewish prejudices died, and he took the world to his heart. Jew and Gentile turned to one another and clasped hands, and said: 'Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another.'

'I attended,' says Dr. J. D. Jones, 'a great religious conference in Boston, U.S.A., many years ago. The platform of the hall in which we met was decorated with flags—the flags of the various nations represented in the conference. But in the middle were hung side by side, and interfolded, the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes. Above those two flags there was hung another flag—a small flag, which consisted of a Cross on a white ground. One day an American speaker explained to us strangers what that tiny flag with the Cross on it meant. It was the flag that floated at the mast-head of American warships during Divine Service. "It is the only flag," he added, "that ever floats above the Stars and Stripes." On that day it was floating above the Union Jack as well. The Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes were, so to speak, linked together by the flag with the Cross on it. But it is not the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes alone which will float side by side, but the flags of all the nations will float in friendship and peace side by side when the flag with the Cross on it floats over them all.'

Books that have influenced our Epoch.

Carlyle's 'Sartor Resartus.'

By PROFESSOR W. P. PATERSON, D.D., LL.D., THE UNIVERSITY, EDINBURGH.

CARLYLE'S *Sartor Resartus* ranks in English Literature as the work of a man of genius who had unique command of the resources of our composite language, blended glowing imagination with grim humour, and

in his impassioned prose often reached the sublime. And the substance is as remarkable as the literary form. It is primarily an investigation into the nature and the functions of clothes. From this it

passes to Philosophy, indicates a theory of knowledge, and outlines a metaphysical interpretation of man and the world in relation to God. Further, the philosophical message is illustrated, negatively and positively, by chapters of the spiritual autobiography of the author, who appears under the mask of the German Professor Teufelsdröckh. Finally, the writer being a lay-preacher, he seeks to make his doctrine profitable for correction, for reproof, and for instruction in righteousness.

I.

CLOTHES PROPER AND THEIR USES.

Reasons for wearing clothes must have been given ever since there was a language in which to express ideas. In later times much has been written about dress by the poet, the historian, and the novelist. In the *Tale of a Tub*, Dean Swift showed that it was an excellent subject for the satirist. Acknowledging a debt to Swift, Carlyle recognizes five uses which raiment has served in the economy of human life.

(a) Clothes serve for warmth and protection. As a babe, 'what hadst thou been without thy blankets, and bibs, and other nameless hulls? Dost thou not rejoice in them as in a warm movable House, a Body round thy Body, wherein that strange THEE of thine sat snug, defying all variations of Climate?' (Bk. i. ch. 9).

(b) They serve for adornment. 'The pains of Hunger and Revenge once satisfied, man's next care was Decoration. For Decoration he must have Clothes. Nay, among wild people, we find tattooing and painting even prior to Clothes' (i. 5).

(c) They serve to conceal. To them we owe decency, and also much more. 'Is not Shame the soil of all good manners and good morals? When we view the fair clustering flowers that overwreathe, for example, the Marriage-bower, and encircle man's life with the fragrance and hues of Heaven, what hand will not smite the foul plunderer that grubs them up by the roots?' (iii. 3).

(d) They serve to reveal. They have symbolical significance, and it lies in the nature of a symbol that it reveals as well as conceals. To some extent a man is known by his clothes as well as by his friends. In particular there is one kind of man—'the dandiaca body'—who makes known through the excessive adornment of his person the absurd value which he sets on himself. For 'this Dandiaca Sect is but a new modification, adapted to the new time, of that primeval superstition, Self-worship' (iii. 10).

(e) They have a mystic efficacy in influencing human conduct. 'Is not the fair fabric of Society itself, with all its royal mantles and pontifical stoles, whereby we are organised into Polities, into Nations, and a whole co-operating Mankind, the creation of the Tailor alone?' (iii. 11). Consider, for example, the power which goes forth from the judge in virtue of the robes he wears. 'You see two individuals, one dressed in fine Red, the other in coarse threadbare Blue: Red says to Blue, "Be hanged and anatomised"; Blue hears with a shudder, and (O wonder of wonders!) marches sorrowfully to the gallows; is there noosed-up, vibrates his hour, and the surgeons dissect him, and fit his bones into a skeleton for medical purposes' (i. 9).

In view of these considerations, and chiefly because of the mystic efficacy, it was submitted that it was high time to revise the current estimate of the dignity of the tailor's craft. The patcher ought to be re-patched, the tailor re-tailored, by enlightened opinion. Still more evident was this when it was realized—which is the next step in the argument—that there are spiritual forms of tailoring which have produced many of the most important things, both in the social sphere and in the realm of Nature, and that the Tailors' Guild might therefore include such craftsmen as the lawgiver, the poet, and the prophet.

II.

CLOTHES METAPHORICAL AND A PHILOSOPHY.

To the witty or poetical minds which are in the habit of comparing ideas, it has naturally occurred that there are other beings than the human biped which have wrappings that are similar to clothes, and that render similar service. The most obvious parallel is the case of the individual writ large—the collective personality of a society, of a nation, or of the race. A second object with its vestments of a sort is the universe. The third—with reverence be it spoken—is God. What is the nature of the raiment of these three, and what the significance of the interpretation for life and conduct, it is the chief purpose of *Sartor Resartus* to declare and illustrate.

1. *The Clothing of Nations*.—In the case of human societies the clothes consist of their equipment of institutions, laws, customs, and religious beliefs, along with 'the solemnities and paraphernalia of civilised life.' The analogy had been used by Burke to give point to his strictures on the vandalism of the French Revolution. It was, he

conceived, the attempt of a people, or at least of a mob, to strip itself of the garments of chivalry and loyalty which it requires for decency, not to speak of adornment and dignity. By this new conquering Empire of Reason all the decent drapery of life was to be rudely torn away. 'All the super-added ideas, furnished from the wardrobe of a moral imagination which the heart needs, and which the understanding ratifies as necessary to cover the defects of our naked shivering nature, and to raise it to dignity in our own estimation, are to be exploded as a ridiculous, absurd, and antiquated fashion' (*Works*, 1808, v. p. 151).

Carlyle agreed with this view of the value of national habiliments and gave additional reasons in its support. They not only imparted beauty and dignity : they served the purpose of protecting a people from injury and even of preserving its life. Not least was this true of the religious creed which might be called the Church-clothes. 'I remark that without such Vestures and sacred Tissues society has not existed, and will not exist. For if Government is the outward Skin of the Body Politic, holding the whole together and protecting it, then is Religion the inmost Pericardial and Nervous Tissue, which ministers Life and warm Circulation to the whole. Without which Pericardial Tissue the Bones and Muscles (of Industry) were inert, the Skin would become a shrivelled pelt, and Society itself a dead carcase' (iii. 2). He also found that state-raiment signally exercises the mystic power which was noted in clothes—as seen in the spell which is laid by national symbols upon the imagination and the heart. 'Have not I myself known five—hundred living soldiers sabred into crows'-meat for a piece of glazed cotton, which they called their Flag' (iii. 3).

On the other hand, Carlyle found it necessary to press an observation which Burke slurred over—viz. that clothes wax old, when they must either be repaired or thrown aside. The Church clothes, he conceived, had gone 'sorrowfully out at elbows.' Christianity was imperishable, as it was indispensable, but there were considerable Christian doctrines which he called Hebrew old-clothes, and deemed to be no longer fit for use. He was also of opinion that England's garb of aristocracy had become shabby in the latter days. 'Where now,' he exclaims, 'are the Hengsts and Alarics of our still-growing, still-expanding Europe who, when their home is grown too narrow, will enlist, and, like Fire-pillars, guide onwards those superfluous masses of indomitable living Valour ; equipped, not now with the battle-axe and war-chariot, but

with the steam-engine and ploughshare ? Where are they ? Preserving their Game !' (iii. 4).

2. The Vesture of the World.—Dean Swift had described a sect of clothes-worshippers who construed the world in terms of tailoring. They held the universe, he says, 'to be a large suit of clothes which invests everything ; that the earth is invested by the air, the air is invested by the stars, and the stars are invested by the *primum mobile*. What is that which some call land but a fine coat faced with green ? or the sea but a waistcoat of water tabby ?' (*Tale of a Tub*, ii.). He had added that many other applications could be made, and a student of Philosophy could readily give to the conceit a more profound turn. Since Locke, it was generally held that at least the secondary qualities are due to the perceiving subject, and these could therefore be thought of as a garment with which the mind decks and beautifies the realm of 'things in themselves.' A disciple of Berkeley could conceive of the apprehending mind not only as a tailor that clothed the world, but as a manufacturer that brought it into existence. As aptly could the idea be applied to the system of Kant, with its doctrine of the ideality of space and time, and of the all-important work done by the understanding in building up by its categories the world of experience. In 1823 Carlyle had written contemptuously of the results of the Kantian Philosophy as turning out to be 'but a helmet of rusty iron large as a kitchen-pot, and within it a head but little bigger than a nut' (*Froude, ibid.* p. 158). Three years later he went more deeply into the *Critique of Pure Reason*, when he seems to have accepted generally its theory of knowledge, and in particular to have been deeply impressed by its doctrine 'that Space and Time, the WHERE and WHEN, so mysteriously inseparable from all our thoughts, are but superficial, terrestrial adhesions to thought' (i. 8). And so the human mind, in another point of view the world, got their suit of clothes in the shape of the *a priori* elements of knowledge and especially of the forms of space and time. The uses ascribed to these clothes were mainly two. They served for adornment—so much so that in describing the work of the tailor, Carlyle often thinks of him as an artist. Space and time are 'the Canvas whereon all our Dreams and Life-visions are painted. So that this so solid-seeming World were but an air-image, our ME the only reality : and Nature, with its thousandfold production and destruction, but the reflex of our own inward Force, the "phantasy of our Dream"' (i. 8). The second use, which is rather a disservice, is that they veil the

essential nature of the world. ‘Deepest of all illusory Appearances are your world-enveloping Appearances, SPACE and TIME. These, as spun and woven for us from before Birth itself, to clothe our celestial ME for dwelling here, and yet to blind it—lie all-embracing. In vain, while here on Earth, shall you endeavour to strip them off; you can, at best, but rend them asunder for moments, and look through’ (iii. 8).

3. The Garment of God.—The youth may have heard a sermon on the God who covereth Himself with light as with a garment. The man was never tired of quoting the earth-spirit in Goethe’s *Faust*:

‘Tis thus at the roaring loom of time I ply,
And weave for God the garment thou seest Him by.’

And it is the idea of God and His raiment that is the culmination of the message of the book.

In applying the conception to the Divine Being, Carlyle again thought chiefly of the double use of the clothes metaphorical as concealing and revealing. The garment of God in the widest sense was Nature.—the realm of Creation and Providence. Specially was man, in his greatness and littleness, a garment symbol of God that revealed in part, and that concealed in part. ‘The Universe is but one vast Symbol of God; what is man himself but a Symbol of God?’ in which as symbols ‘the Infinite is made to blend itself with the Finite, to stand visible, and, as it were, attainable there’ (iii. 3). More specially is God revealed in the gifted souls who body forth the beautiful, and render the Divine visible, in true works of Art. Most specially has He lived and wrought in the persons and the deeds of heroic men, and in the greatest of them mankind has rightly recognized and worshipped a present God. ‘If thou ask to what height man has carried it in this manner, look on our divinest Symbol: on Jesus of Nazareth, and his Life. Higher has the human Thought not yet reached: a Symbol of quite perennial, infinite character; whose significance will ever demand to be anew inquired into, and anew made manifest’ (iii. 3). Christ, further, as highest manifestation of the Divine, exemplified in the most impressive fashion the power that lies in the adequate symbol of the Divine to set the human heart afame, and to incline the will to heroic self-sacrifice. In all religions one indispensable element was ‘some symbolic representation whereby the Divinity was sensibly manifested,’ and those who proposed a new religion without this element as did St. Simon, knew neither the genius of religion nor the springs of human action (Wilson, *ibid.* p. 207).

Carlyle nowhere definitely expounded a doctrine of the being and attributes of God. He even objected to any label being attached to his theology. In a letter to Sterling in 1835 he said: ‘I am neither Pantheist nor Pottheist, nor any Theist or Ist whatsoever, having the most decided contempt for all manner of System-builders, feeling well before-hand that all such are and even must be wrong’ (*ibid.* p. 389). But after all a man either is or is not a theist. He either believes or he does not believe that God is a self-conscious Spirit, possessed of moral attributes, who knows and cares for His creatures. And Theism, there is good reason to hold, was Carlyle’s personal creed, though he laid such stress on the Divine immanence that he could be misconceived as identifying God with Nature, or with Nature on its inner side. He used the name of God as a name whose meaning was generally understood in a Christian country, and if he had meant by it something so radically different as the impersonal spirit of the pantheist he was too honest not to have said so. He spoke of God as ‘my Father’—which name is very inappropriate in the mouth of one who does not hold God to be a self-conscious Being. He prayed to God as a person addressing himself to a person, as in the petition recorded in his ‘Note-book,’ ‘Grant me, O Father, enough of wisdom to live well, prosperity to live happily—easily—grant me or not, as Thou seest best’ (Wilson, *ibid.* ii. p. 136). ‘My belief in a special Providence,’ he wrote to Emerson, ‘grows yearly stronger, unsubduable, inexpugnable’ (p. 385). Though Mr. Wilson says he was not interested in the Jewish Jehovah (p. 222), his French Revolution is a solemn republication of the teaching of the Hebrew Prophets as to the retributive justice of God. The theistic interpretation of his utterances, it may be added, was supported by Froude on the ground of their private intercourse. ‘It was not credible to him,’ he said, ‘that intellect and conscience could have been placed in him by a being which had none of its own. God was to him the fact of facts. He looked on this whole system of visible and spiritual phenomena as a manifestation of the will of God in constant forces, not mechanical but dynamic, interpenetrating and controlling all existing things’ (*Thomas Carlyle*, ii. p. 5).

III.

THE ILLUSTRATIVE EXPERIENCE.

The philosophy of the metaphorical clothes was no mere *jeu d'esprit*, but the exposition in fantastic

form of beliefs which had had for Carlyle the character of a revelation and even the value of a gospel. This is brought out and illustrated by the portrait and biography of Professor Teufelsdröckh, who, though declared to be mythical in various particulars, and who in others was idealized, undoubtedly represented Carlyle in his birth, upbringing, and education, in his character, talents, interests, and behaviour, and, above all, in the stages of his spiritual history. The experience described in the story of the German professor is of a type which figures prominently in modern studies of the Psychology of Religion. It is the experience whose first stage is the 'primitive credulity' of the child of a Christian home; the second, a reaction of revolt and negation; the third, deliverance and a liberalized positive creed.

1. *The Faith of Childhood.*—Carlyle's inherited faith was the orthodoxy of the straitest sect of Scottish Evangelicalism. And this was commended to the boy by authorities before which he bowed in reverence. His father, James Carlyle, mason by trade, with powers of thought and speech comparable to those of the son, found a satisfying view of existence in the 'Shorter Catechism,' while he adorned his doctrine by a laborious and earnest life. His mother, also gifted, and making of her son a lifelong friend, was much in prayer for him in his intellectual pilgrimages, and saw to it that with all his learning he did not forget to read his Bible. On Sundays they worshipped in a Secession Chapel under the Rev. John Johnstone—'the priestliest man,' says Carlyle, 'I ever under any ecclesiastical guise was privileged to look upon, and in that poor temple, rude, rustic, and bare, were tongues of authentic flame which kindled what was best in me' (Froude, *op. cit.* i. 10).

With this theological training he proceeded in due course to the University of Edinburgh, intending the ministry, and on the conclusion of his Arts Course he took a partial session in the Divinity Hall. Had Chalmers filled the Chair of Divinity twenty years earlier Carlyle might have persevered in the career, but he did not come in contact with any such spiritual force, and so turned aside to school-mastering in Kirkcaldy. And now, and in the years of unemployment that followed, the doubts which had gathered in the academic period seem to have grown to a far-reaching unbelief as he made ever deeper acquaintance with the history of modern Europe and with its schools of thought.

2. *The Eclipse of Faith.*—The view of existence and life which made a temporary appeal was a

thoroughgoing religious and moral scepticism. The tempter suggested that God is a dream and the one solid reality the material world. And for a season it was the hour and the power of darkness in the form of Materialism. 'To me the Universe was all void of Life, of Purpose; it was one huge, dead, immeasurable Steam-engine, rolling on, in its dead indifference, to grind me limb from limb.' 'It is all a grim Desert, this once-fair world of his; wherein is heard only the howling of wild-beasts, or the shrieks of despairing, hate-filled men, and no Pillar of Cloud by day, and no Pillar of Fire by night, any longer guides the Pilgrim' (ii. 7). As to Morality, the tempter suggested that it was a convention whose authority had been much overstated. What we call duty 'was no divine Messenger and Guide, but a false earthly Fantasm made-up of Desire and Fear; Virtue some bubble of the blood, bubbling in the direction others *profit* by' (ii. 7). The 'Everlasting No,' the spirit of negation (*Goethe's Geist der stets verneint*), was felt to have the best of the argument. 'As he wanders wearisomely through this world, our friend has now lost all tidings of another and higher. He hides not that, in those days, he was wholly irreligious: "Doubt had darkened into Unbelief," till you have the fixed, starless, Tartarean black' (ii. 7). Yet in one point he did not give way. If he could not disbelieve the Spirit that denies, he could at least hate him. If he must accept the theory of a godless universe, at least he need not cower before the Juggernaut. 'The Everlasting No had said: "Behold, thou art fatherless, outcast, and the Universe is mine (the Devil's)"; to which my whole Me now made answer: "I am not thine, but Free, and forever hate thee!"' (ii. 7). The moral consciousness at least was unsubdued.

3. *The Deliverance.*—Upon this grim and prolonged struggle there followed the experience which he was not ashamed to call a conversion. He even gloried in the word as signifying 'a new-attained progress in the Moral Development of man: hereby has the Highest come home to the bosoms of the most Limited' (ii. 10). What had been hidden from Socrates and Plato had been revealed to your Zinzendorfs, your Wesleys, and the poorest of their Pietists and Methodists. It is true that the conversion reported in *Sartor Resartus* was lacking in features which were central in the evangelical type of religious experience. The writer showed little sense of his own sinfulness, said nothing about deliverance from the guilt of sin, and seemed to feel no need of any form of atonement. But it was still a conversion of a real kind, which coincided

with the traditional evangelical form in at least four important particulars.

(a) The conversion began with illumination. The theological treatment recognizes a first stage in which the mind is enlightened in the knowledge of Christ, and in Carlyle's version this was repeated in more general terms. 'It is with man's Soul as it was with Nature : the beginning of Creation is—Light. Divine moment, when over the tempest-tossed Soul, as once over the wild-weltering Chaos, it is spoken : Let there be Light !' (ii. 9). In his case the content of the revelation was that the fundamental reality is Spirit—not matter—and that the Supreme Being is the Infinite Spirit. With this view, with which one 'trod the old rags of Matter into the mire, and exalted Spirit above all earthly principalities and powers,' it seemed to him that a man with force of vision and heart might pierce into the mystery of the world (iii. 1).

(b) The gospel thus apprehended was appropriated by faith. Not by mere intellectual assent, but by a saving faith that was an act of will, he made it his personal possession. The object of this faith is the God who has Nature for His garment, but who is more than the garment. 'O Heavens, is it, in very deed, HE, then, that ever speaks through thee ; that lives and loves in thee, that lives and loves in me ?' 'The Universe is not dead and demoniacal, a charnel-house with spectres ; but godlike, and my Father's !' (ii. 9).

(c) There was peace and joy in believing. 'Sweeter than Dayspring to the shipwrecked in Nova Zembla ; ah, like the mother's voice to her little child that strays bewildered, weeping, in unknown tumults ; like soft streamings of celestial music to my too-exasperated heart, came that Evangel' (ii. 9). Peace was, indeed, no constant possession of the later years, and he did not think that man was made for happiness, but he remembered that in the conversion he had at least a foretaste of rest and blessedness.

(d) There was a call and an impulse to a life of new obedience. In the evangelical scheme regeneration is followed by sanctification and good works, and the sequel to the Carlylean conversion was of the same character. He was conscious of a moral elevation which could be described in the rapt moments as annihilation of self. Above all, he felt inspired and constrained to bring forth the fruits of righteousness. The deliverance, for one thing, entailed on him the duty of devoting himself to a mission. 'I too could now say to myself : Produce ! Produce ! Were it but the pitifullest, infinitesimal fraction of a Product, produce it, in

God's name. Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy whole might.' It also imposed on him with new urgency the old commandment that thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. 'With other eyes could I now look upon my fellow man : with an infinite Love, an infinite Pity. O my brother, why cannot I shelter thee in my bosom, and wipe away all tears from thy eyes !' (ii. 9).

IV.

SIGNIFICANCE AND INFLUENCE.

Sartor Resartus met with a disappointing reception. One publisher after another declined it. When at last it appeared in instalments in *Fraser's Magazine*, subscribers used strong language, and the editor was warned that he was seriously damaging its circulation. The author sardonically reproduced the general opinion when he said to an acquaintance, 'Madam, it is a work born in darkness, and destined for oblivion' (Wilson, *ibid.* p. 73). On the other hand, there were a few who agreed with Mrs. Carlyle that it had the hall-mark of genius. We hear of a Scottish minister who considered it as 'fell preaching' in its way as that of Chalmers, and of a Scottish postman who excused his absence from church by the plea that he had to finish Carlyle's wonderful book. Americans discovered that it was a big thing, and admirers began to write him and to interview him. In due course it was valued as the most characteristic utterance of an accredited prophet, became a classic, and was elucidated by commentaries. It had thus considerable influence in the mighty ferment of thought—political, philosophical, and religious—that was to develop in the course of the nineteenth century.

The political philosophy of Carlyle is contained in germ in *Sartor Resartus*, but the doctrines were too slightly handled and were set forth in too bizarre a fashion, to make much impression. They only began to work as a leaven when they had been expounded and applied in *Heroes and Hero-Worship*, the *French Revolution*, and the *Latter-day Pamphlets*. At most it could be said that the serious student learned from the oracles to look with his own eyes at the actual facts of a political situation instead of borrowing a formula about them, and also was disposed to think that there are excellent reasons both for cherishing old institutions and for making very radical attempts to reform them.

On the philosophical side the book helped to popularise fundamental tenets of the idealistic

School. He professed, as we saw, to despise systems and to have no system, but at another time he could say that 'with a basis of experience speculation finds a centre to revolve about, and to fashion itself into system' (ii. 9). As a fact he had himself reached a definite and coherent view of existence based on the principle of the primacy of spirit. And so doubtless the book has made of many a docile reader something of an idealistic philosopher, and that without his knowing it.

The chief significance of *Sartor Resartus* lies in its contribution to a Philosophy of Religion. It was the product of an age of religious storm and stress, when many had found 'that the Mythus of the Christian Religion looked not in the eighteenth century as it did in the eighth,' but also had realized afresh that the world could not dispense with the gospel which it enshrined, and with the spiritual energy which it generated. It seemed accordingly to them that two things were necessary—to redefine the essential content of Christianity, and to commend and defend it by a more effective argument. One way was to fasten on religious experience, to extract from it the essence of Christianity, and to contend that this was self-authenticating. The other was to reduce Christianity to a metaphysical and ethical doctrine, and to claim for this the support of Reason. The latter was the way which was taken by Kant and Hegel, and followed up at a later date with full equipment, by the Anglo-Hegelian School of T. H. Green, and by the Scoto-Hegelian School of the Cairds. It is in this movement that Carlyle has his place—as a fragmentary

contributor, it is true, but also as a brilliant and influential British pioneer. This school of theological philosophy or philosophical theology has had to face two criticisms. It has been objected that it mutilated Christianity in defining it—as notably in the treatment by Carlyle, who only believed in miracles in the sense that everything is miracle, and who does not appear to have believed in personal immortality. But even so, it is better to believe in a fragmentary Christianity than in none. The second objection has been that Christianity was made dependent on a philosophical system, and was thus involved in the fortunes of a school whose doctrines might prove to be only a passing fashion. But while there is force in this, the spiritual philosophy to which Carlyle was a witness must be in principle as indestructible as Christianity. And certainly it was a beneficent factor in the religious life of our country during the nineteenth century. It enabled Carlyle to continue in spiritual communion with his saintly mother, and this with the honest conviction that, however they might differ in secondary matters, they were one by faith in God, and in the Son in whom He is revealed. And the friendship of Carlyle with his mother is a symbol of the effect produced in wide circles by the spiritual philosophy which has a witness in *Sartor Resartus*. For in the nineteenth century, when the everlasting No threatened to go from strength to strength, this spiritual philosophy had no small influence in keeping the highest intellectual culture of the age in friendly relations with Christianity, and in bespeaking reverence for the faith once delivered to the saints.

Incarnation versus Inspiration.

BY THE REVEREND NORMAN HOOK, M.A., NEWBURY, BERKS.

WHILST it is the task and duty of every age to interpret the significance of Christ in terms that will make Him a living reality, and a magnet of irresistible attraction, it must follow that this task can only be successfully done in so far as the significance of Christ is interpreted in the thought-forms which are the commonplace of the day.

To the earliest Christians, Christ was Messiah and the pre-existent Son of God. To a later generation, He was the Eternal Logos. These

were categories of thought commonplace and real to the people of the time, into which could be satisfactorily fitted the values for which Christ stood. In the course of the ages these thought-forms have changed, but the values for which Christ stands remain the same.

I do not think that any one could say that we have succeeded as yet in interpreting Christ in terms that would make Him irresistibly appeal. But if we have failed, it is due to no lack of vital interest and industry. Christ is still the dynamic

centre of attraction, and more books are written about Him in one year than about any hundred of the world's heroes in a generation. The attempts which have been made, and are being made, to make Him real to this our own age, may be broadly divided into two classes. One class belongs to the category of Incarnation, and the other to the category of Inspiration. Before I proceed to define these terms for the purpose in hand, allow me to say that this distinction is perhaps more arbitrary than real, referring more to inclination and point of view than to hard-and-fast distinction. The purpose of this article is concerned with the position of those who claim that Inspiration as a theory is sufficient to explain the fact of Christ, or conversely that Incarnation is sufficient of itself to do likewise. Keeping this in mind, we may proceed to define our terms.

The term 'Inspiration' has reference to the normal means of God's indwelling in man, witnessing to the fact that it is the special prerogative of man to have fellowship with the great Spirit that is behind and above and within all things. It is not for us to define what is not the Inspiration of the Spirit, much less to confine it to religion. But if we were asked to point to an obvious illustration of Inspiration in religion, we should point, I take it, say, to the prophets of Israel. Here Inspiration is unmistakable, issuing in a lofty morality, a sensitive social conscience, and a claim to speak about the things of God with authority.

But in contradistinction to the prophets of Israel, when we speak of the Inspiration of the Christ, we use the word 'Incarnation.' This word connotes a difference. It witnesses to the belief that God has spoken absolutely and finally in Jesus, and in a way in which He has spoken neither before nor since. His case is different from the rest of men, and a different word is required to account for it. This, at least, is the point of view of Orthodoxy.

Now much of the burden of our present-day controversy is as to whether it is possible, or not, to interpret the fact of Christ along lines of Inspiration. There are those who would contend that the term 'Incarnation' is associated with pagan mythology, corresponding to nothing that is embraced within the circle of human experience. They urge that the indwelling of God in Christ must be explained along the lines of God's indwelling in any man. The difference between divinity in Christ and divinity in us is one of degree and not of kind. In so far as men respond to the great Creator-Spirit, they may be said to be inspired, and Christ was perfectly inspired because His

response to the Spirit was perfect. Indeed, it may be said of Him, that in Him dwelt 'all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.' Broadly speaking, this does not unfairly represent the point of view of some of the Modernists. But to the Orthodox it is not sufficient to equate the Inspiration of Christ with the prophetic temperament, however absolutely you may qualify it. It was absolutely unique, the uniqueness constituting the very heart of the gospel ; and a unique Inspiration, they would argue, demands a unique explanation, *i.e.* Incarnation.

Before criticising, it is important that we should be certain that we understand the issues. Especially should we rid our minds of such immature notions as that the Modernists are the enemies of the Faith. They are sincere men who are striving to make Christ real to themselves and to their generation, and if the Faith be the Truth, why be alarmed ? The Modernist, confessing faith in the divinity of Christ, wants to link Him up with the rest of humanity. He wants to see Christ as one of us, and therefore in a real sense our Elder Brother and our Example. Above all, he desires to make Christ real to the men and women of his day. He contends that very often the Orthodox Christ is not a real Christ. The controversy, then, is by no means purely academic, and I propose to digress at this point in order to estimate its urgency.

(1) I would ask some pertinent questions by way of reference. Do the people of our parishes vitally believe that Jesus is the God-man ? Are their hearts afire with a passion to serve Him ? Do they come through storm and tempest in crowds to make use of the means of grace to which He attached a command ? Is religion a deep surging influence in their lives ? There are some who would reply that at heart our people are sceptical, and that they do not do these things just because they have no desire to do them. Others would say that the Christ of current Orthodoxy is far removed from their understanding. Whatever be the reason, it is clear that they have not grasped or accepted the implications of what we mean by the Incarnation. WHY ?

(2) I have had some little experience of contact with our very modern university students. What do they think of Christ ? They speak of Him with reverence as the finest specimen of manhood that ever was. But they have a suspicion that His morality was idealistic, and is thereby not to be taken too seriously. In consequence, their views on moral questions, and especially on divorce, are distinctly 'liberal.' The miracles of the New

Testament they reject, without adequate reason, as glosses. In a word, they do not believe in what we mean by the Incarnation. **WHY?**

(3) The two 'Whys' I have asked may not insignificantly be linked on to another question, namely, 'Is Christ our example?' I remember being asked this question during the War by a corporal who professed himself to be a Theosophist. His contention was that, if Christ was God as man, then obviously there was a difference between Christ and other men, and therefore the injunction that we should follow His example, far from being helpful, was only embarrassing. The answer I gave at the time was, that the question was really superfluous and unnecessary. 'Get to know Christ,' I said, 'and you will discover the power of God within you.'

I doubt whether orthodox theology can answer this question as to whether Christ is our example. Modernist theology professes to be able to do so, but as to how far it succeeds will be a matter for consideration. But the point about the questions I have asked is, I think, a disclosure of the need for presenting Christ in terms intelligible to the modern mind, and in terms comprehensive enough to grip both the man in the pew and the university student.

(1) and (2) show that Incarnation means nothing to these people, or that they reject it. (3) reveals a desire to understand Christ, to make Him more real, to link Him up with the rest of us. And if this desire were universal, it would favour an interpretation along the lines of Inspiration. Can this be done?

Let us realize that Christ was truly human. Reflect how 'the main stress of the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews falls on the genuinely human experience by which Jesus became qualified to be the High Priest of humanity.... The Epistle to the Hebrews, in spite of the antiquarian form of its thought and phraseology, is perhaps the most human and the most "modern" of all the books of the New Testament' (Dr. Bethune-Baker in *The Faith of the Apostles' Creed*, p. 72). Christ was human in His emotions, human in His mental and physical growth, and shared the characteristic thought-forms of His day. When He spoke of disease, He spoke of it in terms of current demonology. When He quoted from the Psalms, He shared the views of His contemporaries as to their authorship. All of which we should expect if He was naturally and truly human.

We read that 'he increased in wisdom,' which means that He learned as we learn. He learned

God's purpose for Himself, and nothing could make Him faithless to it; though the temptation to use His gifts for His own ends must have been very great. We ought to realize that His temptations were real just as ours are real. 'He who falls into sin gives way and yields before he has felt the full force of the temptation' (*op. cit.*, 86). Christ never yielded to sin, and therefore He was capable of feeling the full force of temptation. The same truth may be expressed by saying that, the holier the man, the harder the temptation. This, I believe, is capable of psychological verification. 'It is only in so far as we are good in our dominant psychology that we can be tempted to evil,' writes Dr. Hadfield (*Psychology and Morals*, 38). To the perfectly bad man, temptation would be meaningless. The temptation, then, of the perfectly good man must be in proportion to the perfection of his goodness. Christ fought the battle with our weapons, and won the victory under our drawbacks. He fought a real battle and won a real victory, and the secret of His success was His absolutely undeviating fellowship with the Father.

Now the point of our inquiry is, Will Inspiration account for His moral and spiritual successes? Will it explain the sublime Truth of His teaching? Will it explain His extraordinary and staggering insight into the very heart of Reality? Further, will it explain His claim to authority, and the consciousness of the uniqueness of His mission? Also, will it explain His miracles?

With the exception of the last question, most Modernists would answer in the affirmative. But they would hesitate on the subject of miracle. They would probably rule the problem out of court by *a priori* considerations, which are not easily harmonized with established canons of historical and literary criticism. The phenomena of the life of Jesus, they would maintain, are explicable in terms of Inspiration. The Spirit of God had unimpeded access through Him. His life was a channel in which there were no blockades, and therefore it is a real example to us, for what He did in the power of the Spirit we can do likewise. He has shown us the way, and all we have to do is to follow in His footsteps.

If it be asked, why did Christ have this perfect fellowship with God, and why was His life so perfect a channel for the operation of the Spirit? the answer is, because His response to the Spirit was perfect, i.e. whole-hearted, undivided, and disinterested. This sounds very straightforward and very simple, but it demands a further question. How do you explain the fact that this man of all

men should have been enabled to make this perfect response to the Spirit of God? Is there not an element of uniqueness in the situation which is left unexplained? It is in its failure to account for the uniqueness of Christ that the theory of Inspiration, by itself, breaks down. Supposing that you argue, on the inspirational hypothesis, that God arranged or purposed that this one man, of all others, should make this perfect and unique response to God. We may well believe that God does arrange and purpose things. But to say that God arranged or purposed that this one Man among men should commune with Him as no other man ever did or probably ever will; should go through life, tempted as we are, yet never committing sin; should feel that He was God's instrument for the redemption of the world, without posterity charging Him with insanity; should make claims that no man ever did;—to say that God arranged or purposed this, though not in itself an impossibility, makes too great demands altogether on our faith. Besides, it does not bring Christ any nearer to us. He still remains a unique phenomenon, and, as such, He cannot be our example.

Christ was unique. 'In His case, as in no other, the Divine "personality" expressed itself through a human "personality": the human personality was the personality of God under the conditions of human life' (Bethune-Baker, *op. cit.*, p. 94).

It is in its failure to account for the uniqueness of Christ that Inspiration, as a theory complete in itself, breaks down. What is demanded is some explanation which will provide for this perfect response to the Spirit, issuing in a really human life. It is the contention of the writer that such explanation can alone be found in an act of God which must be for ever unique, *i.e.* Incarnation. It is true that Christ was a real man living a real human life, but this needs to be supplemented by the further statement, that He who lived this life was God under the conditions of human life. Such a being, *ex-hypothesi*, must be unique. And keeping this in mind, we may understand, even though we may not explain, why it is that Christ 'has shown Himself to be an abiding power in the world, an active spiritual force comparable with no other: and why it is that He was able to reveal God as none other had been able.' We shall understand the unique claims He made on men's loyalty and allegiance to Himself, and so we shall come to a real and living faith in His Lordship and Godhead. 'We never need to raise the question, "How can these things be?" When it is raised, the true

answer is, "Come and see," or "Follow thou Me,"' (*op. cit.*, p. 80).

It is not suggested that the conclusion we have reached rules out the value of the theory of Inspiration. It is important, if we are to make Christ real to our age, that we should seek for an explanation of the Godhead of Jesus along the lines of Inspiration, provided we postulate Incarnation. But it is suggested that the difference which must for ever differentiate Him from us, can only be explained in terms of Incarnation. And we may thank God for the difference, for therein lies the assurance to that Life which is Life indeed.

Finally, is Christ our example? It is important to consider what we mean by example. Consider two men each endowed with similar qualities. The one, by a faithful use of those qualities, makes a success of his life, while the other, by abuse, makes a wreck of his life. If somebody should speak to the latter, and urge him to follow the example of the former, then in such a connexion, the word 'example' is legitimately used. Given similar endowments and equal opportunities, then the word has meaning. But when endowments in men differ, as is the case, and opportunities vary, how much meaning has the word then? I might advise a budding young playwright to copy the example of Shakespeare and write another *Hamlet*, but he might aptly reply, that such advice, far from being encouraging, is only embarrassing. He is conscious, at once, that there is a great difference between Shakespeare and himself. Shakespeare was gifted with massive genius: he is not. But, on the other hand, there is a sense in which the advice might well be helpful. It might drive him to study the plays of Shakespeare, their structure, arrangement, and plot. And much good might accrue from such a study. Shakespeare, he will find, can be a real example to him in many ways. He can learn that the secret of a play that is to live, is the faithfulness with which it portrays emotions, and, still more, the skill with which it interprets them. He can learn a thousand other things. Indeed, before he has finished learning, he will be convinced that Shakespeare is to him a real example. This does not imply that he will ever write another *Hamlet*. It does imply that *Hamlet* will inspire him to produce a play to the very best of his abilities. I think that in some such sense as this Christ is our example. A man may never reach the level of Jesus. But the level of Jesus can and will inspire him to reach heights otherwise unattainable.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Old Testament Problems.

THERE is no Old Testament problem on which dogmatism is more unseemly than that of the Decalogue, which has been assigned by equally competent scholars to practically every period between Moses and the early post-exilic age. Professor Ludwig Köhler has given an admirable *conspectus*¹ of the present position of the discussion, setting forth briefly but pointedly the nature of the problems raised, for example, by the alleged relation of the Sabbath to the phases of the moon, by the presence of commands in a series of prohibitions, by the fact that only one sacred cult-day is recognized by the Decalogue, etc. As against Mowinckel, he maintains that an analysis of the sources of the documents in which the two versions of the Decalogue are now embedded gives us really no clue to its date; while upon those who plead for a Mosaic origin he urges the wholesome reminder that the utmost they can claim is that the Decalogue *may*, but not that it *must*, have come from Moses.

To the lively discussion which has gathered in recent years round the Deuteronic problem, Dr. A. R. Siebens has made a highly lucid and valuable contribution,² which takes into careful account the views of Kennett, Hölscher, Horst, Bentzen, Oestreicher, Schmidt, Welch, and others. Dr. Siebens maintains that of all the theories of Deuteronomy that of the school of de Wette-Graf-Wellhausen is, in its broad lines, still the most plausible: the book discovered by Hilkiah must have been some form of Deuteronomy, it had some connection with the reformation of Josiah, and its object was the centralization of the worship at Jerusalem. He makes certain modifications, however, on the prevailing critical theory; he admits that the reforms extended over a longer period than is commonly allowed for, that some were inaugurated before the eighteenth year of Josiah, that while some of the laws were the cause, others were the consequence of the reform, and that the (civil)

¹ In a *Separatabdruck* of the *Theologische Rundschau* (Mohr, Tübingen).

² *L'Origine du Code Deutéronomique, Examen historique et littéraire du sujet à la lumière de la critique contemporaine*, par Dr. Arthur-Robert Siebens (Librairie Ernest Leroux, 28 Rue Bonaparte, Paris; 25 francs).

laws in chs. 19-25 had not the same origin as the religious laws in 12-18. The book, which on its humanitarian side summarizes the teaching of the great prophets of the eighth century, lies somewhere between Hezekiah and 621, probably in the first twenty years of the seventh century. He accepts as authentic the reformation of Hezekiah as described in 2 K 18⁴, connecting it skilfully with the history of the period, and he offers some useful remarks on *waw* with the pf. for the consideration of scholars who propose to disintegrate 2 K 23 on the basis of the occasional emergence of that construction. He has little faith in the theory that Deuteronomy appeared in different editions; in any case there are no sufficient criteria for their discrimination. The book, written obviously by one who has the whole immense literature on Deuteronomy at his finger-ends, makes delightful reading: it is a thoroughly able defence of the commonly accepted view of the origin and purpose of Deuteronomy against the attacks which have recently been hurled at it from opposite flanks.

In the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*³ Eichrodt discusses the question whether O.T. theology has still an independent significance within O.T. science, and Morgenstern deals with the Matriarchate in ancient Israel and its historical implications. H. Hommel, pointing out the striking similarity between Ps 139 and the Vedic hymn (Atharvaveda iv. 16), raises the question whether, in view of the sparse emphasis upon the omnipresence of God in the O.T., the psalm may not be in some way dependent on the hymn. Galliél throws light upon ancient worship by treating certain psalms and other brief sections of the O.T. as liturgical confessions of innocence made by the worshipper before being admitted to participation in the rites. Dr. Welch submits Neh 9 to an acute analysis, and concludes that 'the chapter has preserved a litany written for the worship of Northern Israel, on the occasion of a day of fasting, confession, and prayer.' The adoption of this litany by the men of Judah raises questions of the relation of the South to the North and questions about the composition of Ezr.-Neh. on which we hope Dr. Welch will in the near future throw some much needed light.

JOHN E. MCFAUDYEN.

Glasgow.

³ 1929—Heft 2 (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk. 4.50).

Contributions and Comments.

An Emendation to 1 Peter i. 13.

The text of the First Epistle of Peter has always had an attraction for me, ever since I discovered that it was far from being an exact transmission of what the first author wrote or dictated, and that its pages were frequently subject to discoloration to which one must apply the reagent of common sense, or the ultra-violet rays of insight. It may, therefore, be hoped that many monstrosities of transmission, to which have been attached a similar series of monstrosities of exposition, will ultimately be removed from the view of serious criticism, and reserved only for the lumber-room of the theological antiquary. In this direction of study every little that is an improvement is to be welcomed, and I find that the margins of the successive copies of the New Testament which I wear out are often decorated with *emendanda*, not always intended for publication, and only referred to at this point incidentally in order to suggest, to those who suspect the wisdom of a corrector, that the rule of Horace is often followed according to which certain results of inquiry and certain products of the imagination are to be kept in cold storage for nine years at the very least.

Well, here is a tiny correction to a passage which advises us to 'gird up the loins of our contemplative mind, to be wide awake and to hope perfectly for the grace that is to come our way in the revelation of Jesus Christ.'

The 'contemplative mind' or *διάνοια* is the connecting link with the *διενοόντο* of the previous passage, where I restored it from the Greek text of the *Book of Enoch*, where Enoch says that he 'contemplated' certain truths and visions, by a prevision for those who were to come after him. The correction was obvious when made, and does not need to be reargued at this point: but perhaps it may be said in passing that the associated language about searching 'what or what manner of time' the Spirit was intimating requires the addition of a second *eis* in the Greek, so as to read

eis τίνα η eis ποῖον καιρόν.

We can then translate it

'Inquiring what *person* or what period was implied by the Spirit,' etc.

Coming now to the point at which we were first aiming, when we took up the corrector's pen, not

meaning to use it as a field-marshall's baton, but only as the gentlest of directing wands, what does the writer mean by

νήφοντες τελείως ἐλπίσατε,

whether we take the first word in detachment or isolate the last? What is 'perfect sobriety' or what is 'perfect hope'? The language in either case is unnatural. Suppose we write it in uncial characters and then proceed to emendation. We have

ΝΗΦΟΝΤΕΣ ΤΕΛΕΙΩΣ ΕΛΠΙΣΑΤΕ,

which we transcribe as *νήφοντές τε δεῖ, ἐλπίσατε*. Then the following *ώς* is *de trop* and may be omitted. The injunction was 'to keep wide awake *at all times*', where the increase in the intelligibility of the passage may be held to compensate for the extrusion of two superfluous characters. We may now compare 2 Ti 4⁵.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

Birmingham.

John i. 41.

In your review (May 1929, p. 349) of Dr. Bernard's Commentary on St. John, regarding the reading *πρωΐ* instead of *πρῶτον* or *πρῶτος* in 1⁴¹, your reviewer says that *πρωΐ* 'has the support only of one or two old Latin MSS', overlooking the fact that this is also the reading of the Sinaitic Syriac. Mrs. Lewis (in her *Light on the Four Gospels from the Sinai Palimpsest*, p. 138 ff.), noting the two Old Latin MSS *b* and *e*, with their *mane*, says that Dr. Nestle advised her in this connexion to consult the Old Latin Codex Usserianus, 1₁. Unfortunately the first syllable of every line had disappeared, but before 'fratem suum' stands printed the letter 'e' showing that the missing word was *mane* and not *primum*. (Even that 'e' is now lost from the original MS., but Dr. Abbott is certain it *was* there.) Dr. Wilkins pointed out to Mrs. Lewis that a parallel is found in the *Odyssey* (xxiv. 28) where *πρωΐ* has been restored instead of *πρῶτα* by Kayser, Ameio, La Roche, Faesi, and Munro. In Jn 1⁴¹ *πρωΐ* illustrates the dictum *difficilior lectio potior*. Moffatt adopts it in his translation and adds this footnote, 'The Greek word (*πρωΐ*) has been misread in nearly all the MSS for "first" (*πρῶτον*)', and refers to Mrs. Lewis's *Old Syriac Gospels*. Therefore there is perhaps more to be said in favour of

πρωΐ than is indicated by your reviewer's possibly (may I say?) somewhat inadequate remark.

DONALD, BISHOP OF BENDIGO.

Australia.

1 Peter iii. 18 f.

TAKING this passage as it stands, without any attempt at textual emendation or forced exegesis, it states that, in the belief of the writer, our Lord, after His death and apart from His earthly body, visited certain beings who are described as spirits in prison, and made some announcement to them. Neither the matter of this *kerugma* nor its result is told us. But these spirits are identified with disobedient ones in the generation immediately preceding the Flood in the time of Noah. The mention of Noah and the Flood at once suggested the ark of safety and the instrumentality of water as destructive of the bad and preservative of the good. In this respect it resembled the water of baptism by which Christians are saved through the resurrection of Christ who is seated in heaven at God's right hand.

There is nothing in this passage parallel to the allusion in 4⁶, which speaks of the gospel being preached to the dead. Nor does it lend any countenance to the weird mediaeval imaginations of Christ's harrowing of hell, with all those concomitant phantasies depicted so often in religious art. Whatever the *kerugma* was, it was strictly limited to certain beings belonging to the immediate antediluvian age, and nothing is said as to the contents of the *kerugma* whether of good tidings or of denunciation.

Now, how do the vv.¹⁹⁻²¹ fit into the context and help to enforce the writer's point? He has been urging the duty of patience under suffering, arguing that suffering is the necessary condition of, and prelude to, glory. The supreme example of such passion followed by glorification was seen in Christ who bore silently every kind of indignity and was rewarded with Divine exaltation. This is a perfectly plain piece of teaching which is in no way illustrated or enforced by the assertion of some mission of Christ to a clearly limited and defined set of beings, whether wicked souls or fallen angels, of the antediluvian period. The irrelevance of this side-thought has struck most readers, and the commentators have exhausted their ingenuity in trying to justify it by reading into the words a great deal that they do not say or even hint at.

Now suppose we put brackets round vv.¹⁹⁻²¹

and treat them as an interpolation. We then get a perfectly clear, uninterrupted, consistent, and coherent statement.

'Christ also suffered for sins once for all, . . . being put to death in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit, who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven.'

It seems fairly obvious that vv.¹⁹⁻²¹ do not belong to this context at all, and that they must have been originally either a marginal note or an importation by displacement of a passage from another 'Petrine' writing. The primary source of the statement in v.¹⁹ is undoubtedly the Book of Enoch, where the story of the fallen angels is told and their incarceration described. Enoch was taken to see them, interceded for them, and was told to pronounce their doom. This easily detected reference has led some textual critics to the conjecture that ΕΝΩΚΑΙ (*ἐν ὁ καὶ*) should be read as *ἐν φένωκ καὶ* (ΕΝΩΕΝΩΧΚΑΙ), and this emendation may well be adopted provided that the whole of vv.¹⁹⁻²¹ be removed from their present position, and regarded as an interpolation. Enoch was undoubtedly 'in the spirit' when he was conducted through the realms beyond this earth.

T. HERBERT BINDLEY.

Denton.

Three Obscure O.T. Passages.

THE additions to the literal text made by our translators are often really necessary to make the meaning clear to the English reader. But sometimes the translators favour a meaning that requires addition, when they might have been better to give a literal rendering. (1) Take, for instance, the last clause of Ps 37³⁷ (A.V.), 'For the latter end of that man is peace.' Drop the word 'that,' which is not in the Hebrew, and the translation falls to pieces. The R.V. puts in the margin a literal rendering that might pass muster—'For there is a reward (*or* future *or* posterity) for the man of peace.' This, however, gives a feeling of irrelevancy, though even a soldier, if a good man, should be a man of peace, as the late Marshal Foch proved himself at the Armistice, when he might have gained a more spectacular victory by prolonging the war. But this is only by the way. Let us substitute 'sound man' for 'man of peace,' and we get what seems to me the natural rendering, and one which conveys a needed message for the times; 'Mark the perfect man and behold the upright: for there is a future (*or* a reward) for the sound man' (*or* 'for the future is to the sound man').

(2) I was interested in a recent note on another verse of this kind, Pr 19²³; and I would venture to offer a rendering of my own. V.²² sets forth two independent axioms and so does v.²³ as it stands, and I would translate it thus : 'The fear of the Lord is unto life, or conduceth to life ; and the satisfied man (*or* the contented man) taketh his rest at night (*or* passeth the night) undisturbed (*or* unvisited) by evil.' That is—' Godliness conduceth to life, and contentment to peaceful nights.'

(3) In the latter part of Ps 8¹ our translators follow ancient versions, as they seem to have regarded the Hebrew text as untranslatable. But is it really untranslatable ? Should not 'ăshér here be translated 'where,' coming, as it does, after 'in all the earth' ? Then here is what we get : 'O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth ! where set thou thy glory above the heavens (*or* where let thy glory reach above the heavens). ' This is a prayer that the earth may be full of the glory of God and overflowing, and filling illimitable space above. The English and the Hebrew view the truth from different angles. The English depicts the glory of God as already shining in the heavens, and manifest on earth, without reference to its recognition. The Hebrew sees even now a measure of recognition in the earth, but longs for the grand consummation foretold in Nu 14²¹, when the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord in such a manner that it cannot be withheld or gainsaid. V.² tends to favour this view, and the verses which come after are not necessarily opposed to it.

D. MUIR.

Morocco.

Sunday School Teaching and the Revised Version.

IN regard to the excellent article by the Rev. F. J. Rae, in the June issue, all who are acquainted with the facts of modern Sunday school life, and will honestly acknowledge them, must wish that such an appeal could, for the truth's sake, be circulated throughout the land. The importance of its suggestions cannot be overestimated. But the more strange, and indeed amazing, is the total absence of any reference to the Revised Version as being, for all teaching purposes, so much superior to the Version of 1611, usually, though wrongfully, known as the 'Authorized Version.' Of its merits as a supreme example of Elizabethan English, and the charm of its associated memories, there is no need to speak. But in the light of Mr. Rae's valuable

article it is surely not enough to say that 'we want a well-printed Bible.' Still more, in these days, we need for our young people a reliably translated Bible, and in hundreds of cases, as Canon Driver publicly affirmed, the older Version is not such. In my recent volume on *Reality in Bible Reading*, published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark, I have definitely specified four hundred instances in which, if truth is to be taught, the older Version is misleading. It is not enough that the teacher should—sometimes—be acquainted with such new and helpful renderings as those of Dr. Moffatt, and, for the New Testament, which is confessedly the most important, Dr. Weymouth's Version, and the 'Twentieth-Century New Testament.' These will not be employed, however excellent, in Sunday school classes. But the Revised Version is easily procurable, and is surely, though slowly, finding its proper place in pulpits. But there are many reasons why it is still more urgently needed in all classes of young people, whether in Sunday or day schools. As a matter of simple fact, ALL the most popular quotations from the old Version are false renderings, and so convey a wrong impression. Surely it is waste of everything to persist in reading what is wrong, under the plea that the teacher can put it right.

FRANK BALLARD.

Sheffield.

'Time-Measures of the Pentateuch.'

MAY I be allowed to point out a serious defect in the Rev. A. T. Richardson's argument in his otherwise interesting and suggestive paper on 'Time-Measures of the Pentateuch' in your August number, just to hand in this Colony ? It is true that the word *shānāh*, which is usually rendered in our version by 'year,' is 'actually almost the same as the Hebrew word for "two,"' but it is by no means correct that it 'properly denotes "that which repeats or recurs." ' The two roots are essentially different. The similarity of the Hebrew pronunciation in the two cases was due to the very familiar defect recorded in the famous case of 'Shibboleth.' *Shānāh*, a year, stands for 'sana,' Arabic شَنَّةٌ. *Shnayim*, two, from which was derived the verb *shānāh*, to double, to fold, to repeat (*not vice versa*), stands for *thnayim*, Aramaic and Arabic *thnayin* (انْدَيْن).

There is no case known in literature of a year of six months. It is true that the Israelites had an ecclesiastical year beginning with Abib about the

vernal equinox, and a civil year beginning at Rosh ha-Shānāh in September or October. But both of them were full lunar years adjusted to the solar calendar.

GEO. B. MICHELL.

Dominica, B.W.I.

In answer to Mr. G. B. Michell, I would quote Gesenius, *Hebrew Lexicon*, ‘נַשׁ—pr. an iteration, sc. of the course of the sun, or of the changes of the seasons.’ Hebrew has the word סָנָה, but not, so far as I can find, נַשׁ. Of course, Arabic was not in existence as a language in the times of the early Genesis records, and cannot be a

certain guide, any more than modern English can guide us certainly in regard to old Saxon.

In his second paragraph, Mr. Michell begs the question at issue. The Pentateuch literature apparently provides the ‘case’ required. As I have pointed out, the month Abib is called the beginning of the *shahah*, and the Feast of Ingathering (about six months later) the end of the *shahah*.

Has Mr. Michell any evidence to produce which will prove that the civil and ecclesiastical years, with their different commencements, were in vogue in Mosaic times, or among nomads?

A. T. RICHARDSON.

St. Boniface College, Warminster.

Entre Nous.

The Religious Motive in
‘The Bridge of San Luis Rey.’

Anatole France somewhere says that even the most admirable books seem to him infinitely less precious for what they contain than for what is read into them. There is, indeed, a kind of Divine receptivity about some books, a *releasing* quality. They serve as an outlet for trammelled spirits. Ever, as it were, in the lulls and hesitations of the author’s scrupulous thinking, the reader may step in, and do what he can to assist. Such books are very endearing. Reviewers do not always speak well of them, but they find their way into the heart of the public and stay there. When *The Bridge of San Luis Rey*, by Mr. Thornton Wilder, was first published in October 1927, it was given a very mixed reception by the reviewers, but every one who read it talked about it to his friends. For while we all thirst to converse about elemental things, it remains the convention to discuss the latest novel. And when a new story deals with those large issues that haunt and mystify us all, it is usually very widely read.

This story begins excellently, with a masterly simplicity. ‘On Friday noon, July the 20th, 1714, the finest bridge in all Peru broke and precipitated five travellers into the gulf below. This bridge was on the high road between Lima and Cuzco, and hundreds of persons passed over it every day.’ There is your first glimpse of the situation, seen plainly and clearly enough, but still from the distance; you are interested, but not deeply moved. Then, while you still gaze towards the scene of the little tragedy, you see other figures hastening to and fro, confused,

perturbed: the incident has affected them profoundly. ‘People wandered about in a trance-like state; muttering, they had the hallucination of seeing themselves falling into a gulf.’

You become more interested, you seem yourselves to be straying across the brilliant Peruvian landscape toward the river and the broken bridge. And now, since you have come so near the gulf, the author, freed from the tyrannies of mundane Time, allows you to see it all happen over again. This time a Franciscan missionary, Brother Juniper, is standing by your side. ‘A twanging noise filled the air, as when the string of some musical instrument snaps in a disused room, and he—that is, Brother Juniper—saw the bridge divide and fling five gesticulating ants into the valley below.’ And now we can listen to this Franciscan’s thoughts, in the silence that follows on that twanging noise. ‘Why did this happen to *those* five?’ he asks himself. ‘If there were any plan in the universe at all, if there were any pattern in a human life, surely it could be discovered mysteriously latent in those lives so suddenly cut off. Either we live by accident and die by accident, or we live by plan and die by plan.’

At this point the author takes us indoors, as it were, and has a little confidential chat. For the next six years, he tells us, Brother Juniper devotes all his time to an inquiry into the lives of those five souls, in the effort to prove that each of them had at that moment received the finishing touch from the Potter’s Hand. Then at the end of those six years he and his manuscripts are publicly burned in the cathedral square. He has learned nothing, except that he himself is a heretic. Long

after, another secret copy of his book is discovered, and by its aid, and as a result of the author's own inquiries and speculations, this little jewel of prose is cut and polished into five facets, each facet the life of one of the victims, seen, as Rachel Annand Taylor said in the *Spectator*, 'from a strange and enchanting angle.' But, even more than by the gem itself, we are held and charmed by the hand that polishes the gem. These pages reveal a spirit that is penetrating without dogmatism, delicate yet clear-cut in all its motions, powerful without being rude, exquisite without being great. 'For all his diligence,' he says, 'Brother Juniper never knew the central passion of Dona Marfa's life; nor of Uncle Pio's, nor even of Estaban's (these were three of the victims). *And I, who claim to know so much more, is it possible that even I have missed the very spring within the spring?*'

The Christian Church is much more dogmatic than its Founder with regard to the facts which lie beyond human consciousness. Dogmatism has become confused with orthodoxy. But if the moral perfection of Jesus imposed upon itself limits to its omniscience, as, for example, when He said : 'Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son . . .' then how narrow a horizon of knowledge dare we claim ! Every moral failure dims our vision, and can Forgiveness, even if it will, restore what is lost ? But what strikes us about Thornton Wilder is how extremely undogmatic, how singularly tentative, are the theories which he allows to emerge from his analysis of these lives. 'Some say we shall never know, and that to the gods we are like flies that the boys kill on a summer day, and some say, on the contrary, that the very sparrows do not lose a feather that has not been brushed away by the finger of God.' Somehow, we think that it is with these last that he agrees, however diffident his manner may be. For again, —perhaps in the most assured of all his sentences,—speaking of a famous actress and her old tutor, he says : 'Whom were these two seeking to please ? Not the audiences of Lima. They had long since been satisfied. We come from a world where we have known incredible standards of excellence, and we dimly remember beauties which we have not seized again ; and we go back to that world. Uncle Pio and Camila Perichole were tormenting themselves in an effort to establish in Peru the standards of the theatres in some Heaven whither Calderón had preceded them. The public for which masterpieces are intended is not on this earth.' The man who wrote those words has found his own soul.

Faith, for Thornton Wilder, remains always a working hypothesis, and the conduct of faith, as implicitly asseverated in this curious tale, is a putting of that hypothesis, by every act and thought, to the test. The hypothesis is the only one which Time and History and the spirit of man have ever justified, the one which rears itself higher and higher, and establishes itself deeper and deeper, as the world grows older. It is the faith in a 'Love that moves the sun and every star.' It is this quality of Love that he finds shaping and dictating all things. He distinguishes it sharply from the lesser loves. 'She had never realized any love save love as passion. Such love, though it expend itself in generosity and thoughtfulness, though it give birth to visions and to great poetry, remains among the sharpest expressions of self-interest. Not until it has passed through a long servitude, through its own self-hatred, through mockery, through great doubts, can it take its place among the loyalties.' Another character, Uncle Pio, is further 'ben.' 'He divided the inhabitants of this world into two groups, into those who had loved, and those who had not. It was a horrible aristocracy, apparently, for those who had no capacity for love (or rather for suffering in love) could not be said to be alive, and certainly would not live again after their death. They were a kind of straw population, filling the world with their meaningless laughter and tears and chatter and disappearing still lovable and vain into thin air. For this distinction he cultivated his own definition of love that was like no other and that had gathered all its bitterness and pride from his odd life. He regarded love as a sort of cruel malady, through which the elect are required to pass in their late youth and from which they emerge, pale and wrung, but ready for the business of living.'

But in the final act of Love which draws the curtain on our mortality, a mystery must remain. That was where Brother Juniper went wrong. That is where some of the critics of this book have gone wrong. They think that for faith everything must be defined, and that Thornton Wilder has been much more definite than they are justified in thinking, and so they conjure up interpretations of his philosophy to suit their own fancy. Mr. Cyril Conolly, for example, refers to 'this theory of spiritual ruination preceding death, which is hence never untimely,' and he adds that the theory now adopted by Mr. Wilder was first put forward by Goethe. But if there is one thing about these untimely deaths that is made clear it is that in three instances at least these lives had broken

afresh into blossom just then, and they were ready and courageous for a braver kind of living than ever before.

The Speaker's Bible.

St. Mark's Gospel has been covered in *The Speaker's Bible* in two volumes, and the second of these is now ready (Speaker's Bible Office, Aberdeen; 9s. 6d. net each). As *The Speaker's Bible* was begun and edited by Dr. Hastings and is now carried on by the editors of this magazine it is not our custom to insert anything in the nature of a review of it here. We have occasionally quoted the reviews of others, but the new volume is only just out so that none has appeared as yet, but here are estimates by the last two reviewers of the first volume: 'it is no exaggeration to say that *The Speaker's Bible* is the greatest thing of its kind in existence,' 'the splendid volumes of this famous series.'

The second volume of Mark deals with chapters ten to the end of the Gospel. Sermons, sometimes more than one, are given on forty texts, the most suggestive thought being chosen in each case, and points driven home and illustrated from the newest essays, poetry, fiction, and current events. A study on 'Influence' has been contributed by Dr. W. M. Grant, and one on 'Fruitlessness,' by the Rev. J. H. Morrison, M.A., while Professor Gossip writes on 'The Cry of Dereliction.' From this the following paragraph is quoted. Some years ago a subject index to the first volumes was prepared. As a large number of readers have spoken of the added value this has given to the series, a further index is included in the new volume.

Most envied?

'We are often told that Mark ends in the darkness with a beaten, disappointed Christ. It is not so, of course. Still, it is well other evangelists have gathered sayings from His lips upon the tree we could ill spare.'

In John He dies with the shout of a Conqueror. And it is well for us to bear in mind that, as it seems, what lifted the depression from His spirit, was that the poor soul hanging there beside Him, awed by something in this strange convict suffering along with him, threw himself on His grace with a dim, inchoate, nebulous faith that was still faith where faith seemed utterly impossible. And it came like a reviving cup of water to our Lord's parched lips and soul. The thing was working then; and God was standing to His promises; and it was not in vain, but coming true. 'It is

finished,' He cried; and gave back to God no broken hope, no failure, no mere gallantry of endeavour that had not succeeded, but a life lived out, and a tremendous task accomplished in the face of every hindrance. Let us remember that. Old Dr. Duncan used to say that of all living beings he most envied the angel who stood by our Lord in the loneliness of His agony in the garden. But why not rather this strange, uncouth, most unlikely comforter when things were darker still? ¹

Lama sabachthani.

'Ezra,' of the *Methodist Recorder*, who never misses any good thing, had an interesting paragraph lately on the 'Untranslated Words of Jesus' in which he retells a story given by the late Dr. George H. Morrison in an address to children. Some years ago, he says, 'the late Dr. George H. Morrison met, in Glasgow, General Agha Petros, Commander-in-Chief of the Assyrian Forces during the World War, and had an interesting conversation with him, being most interested by the news that at his home, away up in the mountains behind Nineveh, they still speak the very language that the Lord spoke. Sometimes the children of General Petros, like other bairns, are a little unwilling to get up in a morning, and, if it happens to be one of the girls, his wife will go to the bedroom, and say, "Talitha cumi," which means, "Daughter, it's time to get up." Sometimes, again, when his children come home from school they find the house door shut, and if nobody comes immediately to open it they shout for admittance, and what they shout is a word very familiar to Gospel readers — "Ephphtha." "But," says Dr. Morrison, "I think the last thing he told us was even more interesting. He said this: 'Supposing my wife and I go out some afternoon, and we leave the family at home, and then, suppose we make more calls than we intended, and we are late in getting home. Of course, in this country the children would not mind in the least, but in that country they are never quite safe, and when the darkness comes the children get anxious, and so when I come to the door the children say, "Lama, sabachthani? Father, what has kept you, where have you been, why have you left us like this?'"'

¹ A. J. Gossip, in *The Speaker's Bible*, 'Mark,' ii. 168.